ABRAHAM LINCOLN

1809–1858

BY

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

With Illustrations

VOLUME IV



BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge

COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY CATHERINE BEVERIDGE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

CONTENTS

I. Republican Advance: Whig Revolt 1

The Bloomington Convention — Lincoln attends — Nominations and platform — Lincoln's speech in Whitney's notes — Lane at Chicago meeting — Position of the old line Whigs — Nomination of Fillmore — Buchanan's career — First National Republican Convention — Its platform — Frémont nominated — Not favored by Lincoln — Votes for Lincoln for Vice-President — Murders in Kansas — Lincoln's moderation in the campaign — Fillmore and Choate on a sectional party — Lincoln on a dissolution of the Union — Move of the Whigs — Campaign meetings and songs — Charges against Frémont — Lincoln's speeches and letters — His lithographed appeal — Buchanan's ten cents a day — White slave article — Election of Buchanan.

II. The Dred Scott Decision 82

Buchanan on the Missouri Compromise — Lincoln at a Chicago lovefeast — Silent on the Compromise — Want of issues — Disunion meeting in Massachusetts — Dr. Emerson and Dred Scott — Missouri decision against Scott — Case carried to United States Courts — Scott's appeal — Argued and position of Supreme Court — McLean's political ambition — George Ticknor Curtis's speech — Buchanan's letter to Justice Grier and the reply — Inauguration of Buchanan — Membership of the Supreme Court — Taney's career — The opinion of the Court — Dissenting opinions of McLean and Curtis — Charges of conspiracy — Seward's account — Chaffee's denial of owning Dred Scott — Absence of comment on the case — Douglas speaks at Chicago — Defence of the Supreme Court — Negro equality — Lincoln's speech in reply.

III. Democratic Split and Republican Opportunity 160

Financial crisis of 1857 — The Lecompton Constitution — Douglas breaks with Buchanan — Douglas's marriage with Adele Cutts — His defence of his opposition to the Administration — Buchanan's Kansas message — Republican praise of Douglas — Lincoln's depression and Herndon's mission to the East — Split in Democratic Party in Illinois — Lincoln favored for the Senate — Fight against the Lecompton Constitution — John Wentworth's ambition — The Springfield Convention — Lincoln endorsed for the Senate — The 'house-divided' speech of Lincoln.

IV. Opening of the Campaign 226

Douglas denounces combination of Republicans and Administration Democrats — Lincoln's disavowal — Ovation to Douglas at Chicago — His opening speech — Considers Lincoln's 'house-divided' utterance — Negro equality — Lincoln's answer — Popular sovereignty — Sacredness of judicial decisions — Nationalizing slavery — Douglas's triumphant progress — Local protective laws necessary for slavery — Volk's description of Lincoln — Douglas at Springfield — Lincoln deals with the arguments — Partisan comment — Lincoln's votes on the Mexican War — His trailing after Douglas — Joint debates suggested — Negotiations and arrangement — A third candidate — The candidates compared — Mrs. Douglas in the campaign.

V. THE GREAT DEBATE 280

Trumbull's charge of a plot — Lincoln undertakes to prove it — First debate, at Ottawa — Douglas reads the Aurora resolutions as the Republican platform — His account of Lincoln's past — The 'house-divided' argument — Lincoln on negro equality — His belief in a 'conspiracy' — Douglas says Lincoln evades questions — Comment on debate — Lincoln prepares questions — The second question disapproved by friends — Ingalls Carleton describes the men — Second debate, at Freeport — Lincoln's answers to Douglas's questions — Slavery in the District of Columbia — Douglas's error on the Aurora resolutions — The 'conspiracy' charge — Douglas states the 'Freeport doctrine' — Slavery in the States — Fred Douglass as example of negro equality — The Aurora resolutions and the right spot — Turner questioned on pledges — Douglas defies his opponents on his record — Third debate, at Jonesboro — Lincoln reads Democratic resolutions against slavery — Slaves as property — Fourth debate, at Charleston — Lincoln on negro equality — Trumbull's attack on Douglas considered — Ownership of Dred Scott — Principles of the Black Republicans — Lincoln calls on Ficklin about votes on Mexican War — Fifth debate, at Galesburg — Hammond's 'mud-sills of society' — Lincoln claims slavery to be a wrong — Douglas and the spread of slavery — Sixth debate, at Quincy — Slavery and the Dred Scott decision — Slavery must be treated as a wrong — The decision and Douglas's popular sovereignty — Carl Schurz on the debaters — Seventh and last debate, at Alton — Bitterness of Administration Democrats — The negro as a citizen — Territories for white men — Slavery and sectional strife.

1858–1861 334

Intention of the author — Election in Illinois — Defeat of Lincoln — His confidence in the future of the party — Jefferson Davis in New England — Opposes Douglas's Freeport doctrine — Douglas in the South — Seward's speeches — Lincoln's caution and Ohio speeches — John Brown's raid—Bates for the Presidency—Lincoln at Cooper Institute, New York — The Charleston and Baltimore Conventions — Nomination of Bell and Everett — Republican State and National Conventions — Nomination of Lincoln — His election.

INDEX 353

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

CHAPTER I

REPUBLICAN ADVANCE: WHIG REVOLT

The Republican Party is founded on freedom and law. It is as broad as the Constitution. SEWARD, May, 1856.

There is merit in the Republican Party. It is this. It is the first sectional party ever organized in this country. . . . It is the North against the South. WENDELL PHILLIPS, June, 1856.

If the South could and did force on the North an exclusively Southern administration, would we submit? Not for a moment. FILLMORE, July, 1856.

If the Republican party wins, I turn my eyes from the consequences. To the South, that government will appear an alien government, a hostile government. RUFUS CHOATE, August, 1856.

The election of Frémont would sound the knell of the Union. Could the South accept a purely sectional rule, a domination solely by the North? Never! TOOMBS, September, 1856.

This government would be very weak indeed if a majority with a disciplined army and navy and a well-filled treasury, could not preserve itself when attacked by an unarmed, undisciplined, unorganized minority. All this talk about the dissolution of the Union is humbug, . . . We do not want to dissolve the Union; you shall not. LINCOLN, August, 1856.

THE weather was very hot in Illinois during the last week of May, 1856. In a room with tobacco bespattered walls and bare floor covered with dirt from the farmers' boots, Davis, fat and bulky, without coat, vest, or collar, was holding court at Danville. Among the lawyers before him, all clad as thinly as the Judge, was Lincoln.

The talk was of Kansas, Sumner, and politics more than of legal disputes and cases to be tried. The Bloomington Convention was at hand and everyone was interested in what it would do. Davis did not think it important enough to adjourn Court. But he told Lincoln to stop at his house while in Bloomington, with two or three mutual friends of Lincoln's choosing.

On May 27 Lincoln left Danville for the convention. Wearing his long, sweat-stained linen duster and tall battered hat, in

his hand his old umbrella tied with a string, he walked along the two boards which, end to end, nailed to crosspieces of wood on the earth, constituted the sidewalk. Behind Lincoln came young Whitney, who went with his hero. At the station they boarded the train which was pulled out by one of the little engines of that day, with much snorting, sparks from the burning wood in the fire-box flying from the bulging and expansive smoke-stack.

They had to go by Decatur, and were joined at Urbana by J. O. Cunningham, editor of the *Urbana Union*. A few others, too, 'mostly young men,' went from that town and Danville; for during Court at those places Lincoln had striven to arouse interest in the convention and to get as many to attend it as he could.[1]

The party reached Decatur in mid-afternoon and, since there was no train to Bloomington before the next morning, they stayed at Decatur all night. To Lincoln the outlook was gloomy. Two weeks before he had been jubilant; he had told his partner that, while on the circuit, he had been testing the public mind and, although in Springfield 'some few corrupt old line whigs who were gaping for office' might join the Democrats, men of both parties in the country were all right and 'becoming more so every day.' Herndon reported this good news to Trumbull, and added that he had never seen Lincoln 'so sanguine of success. . . . HE IS WARM.'[2]

But now Lincoln was not so sure, and frankly said so, as he, Whitney, and Cunningham strolled about town and out into the woods near by, where they sat on a log and talked. Coming back to the hotel, Lincoln grew reminiscent and showed his friends 'the exact spot . . . right in front of the Court House,' where, twenty-six years earlier, the Hanks and Lincoln families had halted their wagon on their long journey to a new abode.[3]

On the way to Bloomington, next morning, few persons were in the coach where Lincoln, Whitney, and Cunningham rode, the only car not filled with tobacco smoke. Lincoln was uneasy

[1] 'Old Major Hall Convention': J. O. Cunningham in (Bloomington, Ill.) *Daily Bulletin*, Feb. 4, 1909. Also Cunningham, in *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 91.

[2] Herndon to Trumbull, May 20, 1856. Trumbull MSS. Capitals Herndon's. A week before the Bloomington Convention anti-Nebraska 'mass meetings' became numerous. *Quincy Whig*, May 24, 1856.

[3] Whitney, 74.

— where were the delegates to the Convention? He was particularly nervous lest none at all should come from the south part of the State which, with Central Illinois, was the stronghold of old line Whigs who were standing by their party. Lincoln went forward, made inquiry, and came back beaming: he had found two delegates from the lower counties;[1] one of them was Jesse K. Dubois of Lawrence County,[2] sour and reluctant, but on his way.

At Bloomington, Lincoln, Archibald Williams, his old associate in the Legislature, T. Lyle Dickey of Ottawa, a good lawyer and a leading Whig, and Whitney, went to Davis's house, and lived there during the Convention.[3] Lincoln and Williams slept in one bed and Dickey and Whitney in another. All were Whigs and conservatives, and all were skilled politicians. The Judge's residence was half a mile from town, and the feverish excitement of the crowds did not reach that tranquil spot. It was an ideal place for calm thought and cool judgment; and Whitney tells us that the course of the historic Bloomington Convention was decisively influenced by the counsels that came from the steady men in the Davis house.[4]

After the noonday meal, Whitney went with Lincoln to the Chicago and Alton depot, to see what delegates would come from Chicago. On the way they stopped at a jewelry shop and Lincoln bought his first spectacles. They cost thirty-seven and a half cents. He was forty-seven years old, he told his young companion, and 'kinder needed' the glasses.[5] At the railway station several delegates got off the train. Among them was Judd.

'That's the best sign yet,' Lincoln whispered to Whitney. 'Judd is there; and he's a trimmer.'[6]

That night the public square rang with speeches, most of them full of fury, made in front of the Pike House.[7] The crowd called on Lincoln. He told a story or two, gave his old illustration of the destruction of the imaginary fence between his field and John Calhoun's field which was filled with hungry cattle, denounced the outrages in Kansas, bewailed the treatment of

[1] Whitney, 74–5.
[2] Cunningham, 92.
[3] Whitney, 73.
[4] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 259.
[5] Whitney, 75.
[6] *Ib.*
[7] *Chicago Daily Democratic Press,* May 30, 1856.

Delahay, and said that he had prepared a speech which he would make at the Convention.[1]

The assemblage at Bloomington was a mixed gathering. It was made up of groups which were suspicious of one another — well-nigh antagonistic, indeed — and had nothing in common except opposition to the extension of slavery, hostility to the National Administration, and hatred of Douglas. The problem was to get them to act together and keep on acting together. Former Democrats like Judd and Palmer were so angry at Douglas that they were willing to go to any lengths; conservative Whigs like Williams, Browning, and Lincoln, were cautious and hesitant; others like Dubois, were doubtful and sullen; radicals like Lovejoy and Codding were for extreme measures; the Germans asked for recognition and a mild disavowal of Know-Nothingism.

The Democratic State Convention, held four weeks earlier, had made support of the Kansas-Nebraska Act the test of party fealty and nominated for Governor Representative William A. Richardson, Douglas's most efficient friend in the Illinois delegation in Congress. These acts had released anti-Nebraska Democrats like Judd and Palmer from further allegiance to the party.[2] But far more important as a rallying cry, was the fact that the Union was again in danger.

More and more the Fugitive Slave Law was being flouted in the North, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which most Southern men had supported as 'a measure of peace,' was being savagely assailed with greater determination than ever, organized sectional effort was being put forth to make Kansas a free State. All these and many other things showed, said the Southern press and spokesmen, that the South must set up for itself. Once more disunion sentiment in that section became as strong as it had been before the Great Compromise, and the hardening determination of the Southern people to form a separate Government of their own was stated with utmost frankness.[3]

[1] *Illinois State Register*, May 31, 1856.

[2] *Era:* Cole, 145.

[3] 'Unless the Great Ruler of the nations shall interpose and stay the hand of northern fanatics and traitors, the issue may be presented to us: Either the Union, with the loss of $1,200,000,000. of property, with an inferior race of three or four millions turned loose

Again Rhett's paper, the *Charleston Mercury*, led the secession movement in the South. Herndon took that paper, he wrote to Trumbull: 'it "foams"' at the Pittsburg Republican manifesto; 'I see the feelings of the South in this disunion sheet;' but, continued Lincoln's partner, 'some of the wind needs to be taken out of the bloat,' and under a bold stand by the Republican Party the South would back down like a blustering but cowardly schoolboy.[1] Yet, as we shall see, a strong but despairing national feeling still persisted in that section.

In Bloomington radical sentiment ran high.[2] On the morning of the Convention, the Chicago papers came with hideous details of 'the sack of Lawrence,' by the 'Border Ruffians' and their accomplices in deviltry, the military hordes from the South. The Free-State Hotel had been destroyed by cannon and fire, houses robbed, patriot arms seized, defenceless men, women and children insulted, abused, and turned destitute upon the streets of their ravaged and ruined town.

Coming on top of highly colored accounts of Brooks's assault on Sumner, these tidings from Kansas inflamed delegates and visitors to fighting wrath. And Sumner was dying, said another rumor.[3] 'Dreadful news from Kansas. My God, what is to be the result?' a worker for the new party wrote to Trumbull.[4]

Lovejoy and Codding made the most of the excitement. Several Free-State men from Kansas were there and one woman, Robinson's wife. The news of the morning was that the 'Governor' had just been arrested without warrant and was, at that moment, 'chained out on the prairie, in default of a jail,'[5] a story typical of the times. Among the Kansans who had come to Bloomington for the Republican Convention were the best

among us to riot without restraint, or a dissolution of the Union with all the horrors that may attend it.' *DeBow's Review*, xx, 561 (June, 1856).

[1] Herndon to Trumbull, Feb. 15, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[2] *Chicago Democratic Press*, May 30, 1856. [3] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 259.

[4] A. Jonas, Quincy, Ill., to Trumbull, May 26, 1856. Trumbull MSS. The Kansas and Sumner outrages arouse 'our men' fearfully. George T. Brown to Trumbull, June 3, 1856. *Ib.*

[5] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 259.

agitators from that Territory who were touring the North — the best except Lane, then on his way to Chicago, where, two nights after the Convention, he was to make an almost unbelievably dramatic and effective speech.

Chief of these Kansas orators at Bloomington, was Reeder. He was 'a lion to the multitude, but no lion to Lincoln,' who disliked and 'was deeply prejudiced against him.' Reeder made a frenzied speech to a big crowd in the Court House square. It was the same that he had been making and continued to make all over the free States. Murder, battle, and sudden death, dripped from every sentence, but he said nothing about his town-site speculation at Pawnee.[1]

Lincoln would not listen to Reeder, did not meet him. Whitney, Williams, and Lincoln chanced to pass when Reeder was speaking. For the moment they stopped.

'He can't overcome me,' said Williams.

'Nor me,' exclaimed Lincoln; 'he would have to do a great deal to overcome my prejudice against him.'[2] Delahay had kept Lincoln informed from Kansas, of what had been done there.

But it looked as though the extremists would control the Convention and pass extravagant resolutions. If they did, the conservative Whigs would not join the new party. They were none too eager in any case; and, as we shall soon see, tens of thousands of them refused to do so. Lincoln was determined that the radicals should not have their way. That they did not, was largely due to his cooling advice and skilful guidance. 'If rash and ultra councils prevail, all is lost,' Browning had informed Trumbull.[3] On the other hand, a New York radical who had been in Illinois expressed the feeling of his fellow extremists in that State: Those who refused to help Kansas 'ought to be hanged for treason;' thousands say 'give us a northern

[1] Cunningham says that Reeder's speech was 'moderate and not denunciatory, . . . only delineating the violence he had witnessed and suffered.' *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 92. But Reeder's set speech which was published as a campaign document, was full of such expressions as, the Free State people in Kansas were worse off than 'Russian Serfs'; members of the Legislature and the territorial officials were 'robbers, house-burners, highwaymen, ravishers, and murderers,' etc.

[2] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 261.

[3] Browning to Trumbull, May 19, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

confederacy. . . . The Union is not worth preserving. Let the South take care of themselves.' [1]

In a talk with Judd and other anti-Douglas Democrats, Lincoln stated the situation; 'Your party is so mad at Douglas for wrecking his party that it will gulp down anything; but our party [Whig] is fresh from Kentucky and must not be forced to radical measures; the Abolitionists will go with us anyway, and your wing of the Democratic party the same, but the Whigs hold the balance of power and will be hard to manage, anyway. Why, I had a hard time to hold Dubois when he found Lovejoy and Codding here; he insisted on going home at once.' [2]

The Convention met in the largest room in Bloomington, known as Major's Hall. It was on the second floor of a two-story brick building just off the Court-House square. Williams, old line Whig, was made temporary chairman and Palmer, anti-Nebraska Democrat, permanent chairman.[3] The Hall was densely packed with delegates and spectators, all expectant and excited, most of the delegates burning with enthusiasm. But an ominous fact justified Lincoln's fear that the south part of the State would not respond to the call — about thirty southern counties sent no delegates.[4]

It had long been agreed on all hands that a Democrat must head the ticket and a German be given the second place upon it. For weeks the anti-Nebraska press, giving voice to the general sentiment of its readers, had declared that Bissell must be made the candidate for Governor; he had overcome his fear that the new party would be a fiasco and had consented to accept the nomination.[5] No sooner had Palmer taken the chair and before the Convention was organized, and the appropriate committees appointed, than a delegate sprang to his feet and moved that the hero of Buena Vista be named. Impulsively

[1] E. W. Hazard of Troy, N.Y., en route from Chicago to Boston, to Trumbull, May 23, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[2] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 260–1. Although a delegate, Dubois would not attend the first session of the convention. 'Seeing Lovejoy and other Abolitionists there . . . he . . . stayed away for the time being.' Whitney, 76.

[3] *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 110.

[4] *Era:* Cole, 145.

[5] Bissell to George T. Brown, May 24, 1856. *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 154–5; also George T. Brown to Trumbull, March 29, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

seconds were shouted from all over the Hall and Bissell was nominated 'with a yell.' [1]

Amid cheering equally ardent and loud, the foremost German in the State, Francis A. Hoffman, was chosen by acclamation as the party's candidate for Lieutenant Governor — a party as yet without a platform or a name. In such fashion the work of the Bloomington Convention began. It was, indeed, a convention of the people. Thereafter, when orderly procedure had been established, the remainder of the ticket — a slate made out by Lincoln and others [2] — was nominated unanimously and as a matter of course. On this slate were Know-Nothings and Whigs only — no Republican was given a place.[3]

Lincoln and an influential German, Frederick Hecker, were named for Presidential Electors at Large. Delegates to the Philadelphia Convention to be held June 17, were named; among them was Lincoln. A State Central Committee was selected; [4] but the name 'Republican' was not given to the new party — indeed, no mention of it appears to have been made during the sessions. One plank of the platform urged 'Anti-Nebraska Clubs' to be formed in every town in the State.[5] In Illinois at that time, the word 'Republican' was,

[1] Cunningham in *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 92–3.

[2] *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 156–8.

[3] James Miller, for State Treasurer, a Whig and also the nominee of the Know-Nothing Convention; Ozias M. Hatch, for Secretary of State, a Whig and a member of the Know-Nothing Convention. *Illinois State Register*, May 31, 1856. Jesse K. Dubois, for State Auditor, an old line Whig and Know-Nothing; William H. Powell, Whig and Know-Nothing, etc. *Ib.*, Sept. 8, 1856.

Many delegates to the Bloomington Convention had also been delegates to the Know-Nothing State Convention. 'This city was well represented by these double faced gentry.' *Ib.*, May 31, 1856.

[4] The official record of the Convention was printed in the *State Journal*, May 30, 1856. Also *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 148–63. Herndon was made Presidential Elector from the Sixth District.

[5] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 4, 1856. The caption of the *State Journal's* account of the Bloomington meeting was 'ANTI-NEBRASKA STATE CONVENTION.' A week later, that paper published an editorial on it, entitled 'THE PEOPLE'S CONVENTION.' It was a gathering 'pre-eminently of the People. . . . Old line Whigs, Jefferson and Jackson Democrats, Republicans, American and foreign born citizens, laying aside all past differences, united together there in one common brotherhood to war against the allied forces of nullification, disunion, slavery propagandism, ruffianism and gag law which make up the present administration party of the Country.' *Illinois Daily State Journal*, May 31, 1856.

In its brief report of the Bloomington assemblage, the New York *Tribune* called it

generally, still hated, and, with the prefix 'black,' Douglas had used it with terrible effect.[1]

At last Browning, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, reported the platform. It was wholly the work of the conservatives. Browning had written every word of it;[2] but Lincoln, who had been with the Committee most of the time during the Convention, had collaborated, and the platform stated his views. Since the Administration had done all it could to promote the extension of slavery, ran the preamble, even to 'the suppression of the freedom of speech, and of the press; and to the revival of the odious doctrine of constructive treason;' and since the delegates were 'convinced that an effort' was being made 'ultimately to change the form of our government,' therefore:

'Forgoing all former differences of opinion upon other questions, we pledge ourselves to unite in opposition to the present administration' and to bring the Government back to the 'principles and practices of Washington, Jefferson and their great and good compatriots of the revolution.'

Congress had power to prohibit slavery in the Territories and ought to use that power; the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was foolish and wrong and in 'open and aggravated violation

'THE PEOPLE'S CONVENTION.' The *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, May 31, 1856, headed its account, 'STATE ANTI-NEBRASKA CONVENTION.'

Only the Democratic press used the word 'Republican' in this connection: 'THE BLOOMINGTON CONVENTION — THE FUSION OF KNOW NOTHINGS AND BLACK REPUBLICANS,' was the title of a long and stinging editorial in the *State Register*, May 31, 1856. 'The black republican convention' was 'a consolidation of the know nothings, abolitionists and renegade sore heads.' *Ib.*

The *Cairo Weekly Times and Delta*, July 2, 1856, under the caption 'THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM,' said that 'it was got up for the purpose of gathering in all the odds and ends of fusion,' etc.

[1] Cunningham, in *Bloomington Bulletin*, Feb. 2, 1909.

[2] 'No resolutions had been prepared for the Convention tomorrow, and no programme of Proceedings settled; and many discordant elements to be harmonized. I procured a room, got 15 or 20 of the leading men of all shades of opinion together, settled upon the order of proceedings tomorrow, and prepared and offered a resolution intended to reconcile both Know nothings and Germans to act with us. After considerable difficulty and discussion, I finally succeeded in getting all who were present to agree to it, and further to agree to support it in convention without objection or amendment.

'After breakfast, and before going to the hotel, . . . I prepared resolutions upon the slavery question, and the subjects now agitating the Country. . . . I was on Committee of resolutions. Presented those I had prepared in the morning — they were accepted — reported to the Convention, and unanimously adopted without change.' *Diary of Or-*

of the plighted faith of the states;' the attempt to 'force slavery into Kansas against the known wishes of the legal voters of that territory' was a 'tyrannous' denial of the right of self-government and 'we will strive by all constitutional means' to remedy that wrong.

Such was the tenor of the resolutions on slavery, Kansas, and the Administration. But something had to be said to make sure of the support of the Germans without alienating the Know-Nothings. So a mild plank was put in that, since 'liberty of conscience as well as political freedom' was guaranteed by the Constitution and the spirit of our institutions, 'we will proscribe no one . . . on account of religious opinions, or in consequence of place of birth.' [1] Trumbull was praised and Douglas abused.[2] Nothing was said, even indirectly, about prohibition.

The only part of the platform which had battle in it was that declaring for the Union: 'We are devoted to the Union, and will to the last extremity, defend it against the efforts now being made by the disunionists of the administration to compass its dissolution, and that we will support the constitution . . . in all its provisions; regarding it as the sacred bond of our Union, and the only safeguard for the preservation of the rights of ourselves and our posterity.' [3]

Then came the time to weld the discordant elements of the Convention and the constituencies they represented, into a harmonious unit, intent on fighting a common foe. All had to be sent away from Bloomington with minds convinced and blood up, and in such fashion that they would not falter or grow cold after they reached home. It was a hard task. The only man

ville Hickman Browning, May 28–29, I, 237. This *Diary* has been edited by Theodore Calvin Pease and James Garfield Randall. Professor Pease's introduction is a careful, accurate, and scholarly sketch of Browning's life, by far the best account of his career that has been written.

[1] The anti-nativist plank and the prominent recognition of the Germans were attacked by the Democrats as hypocritical: 'The black republicans boast that they number in their ranks thousands of Germans who once belonged to the democratic party' — but how would the Germans like to act with men who had tried to degrade them and exalt negroes? *Illinois State Register*, May 30, 1856.

[2] He 'has given the lie to his past history, proved himself recreant to the free principles of his Government, violated the confidence of the people,' etc. *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, May 31, 1856.

[3] *Illinois Weekly State Journal*, June 4, 1856.

there who could perform it was Lincoln. And perform it he did in a speech which, judged by its effect, then and thereafter, was the greatest piece of oratory he ever produced.

He had to use the passions of the crowd and yet hold them in check; he had to satisfy and even arouse the reluctant Whigs, and yet not repel the excited radicals. He had to enlist the Germans and secure the Know-Nothings — without either group the new party could not win. He had to make all factions forget past differences and present dissensions and remember only the one outstanding practical issue on which all agreed, opposition to the extension of slavery. In doing this, Lincoln had to say things which, for the very same reason that he then spoke them extemporaneously, he never would put on paper for publication thereafter.

Under these circumstances, Lincoln made his speech. James S. Emery, one of the Kansas agitators, had just finished. 'The audience had become much wrought up.' [1] From all over the hall came cries of 'Lincoln! Lincoln! Lincoln!' The room was not big, but according to newspaper reports at the time, two thousand men were crowded into it when Lincoln spoke.[2]

Although he had expected to speak, he had not written what he meant to say, as he always had done on important occasion. While Lincoln was speaking, Herndon tried to take notes, but became so excited that he stopped. It is said that John L. Scripps, then editor of the *Chicago Press*, also gave up; but it is not impossible that Lincoln told Scripps not to report what he said, as political speakers often do when they wish their statements not to appear in print. Nor would Lincoln thereafter write out his Bloomington speech. So it was not published in the papers as his other speeches had been and continued to be. In this wise it came to be known as the 'Lost Speech.' But it was not wholly lost. Whitney, cool headed and somewhat cynical, made a summary while Lincoln was delivering it, and from that sketch he wrote out and many years afterward published what his hero said at Bloomington.

A young reporter on the *Chicago Tribune*, Joseph Medill, who

[1] Cunningham, in *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 93.

[2] *Belleville Advocate*, June 4, 1856.

was soon to have much to do with the advancement of Lincoln's political fortunes, was also at the Convention and heard Lincoln's speech. When Whitney's version of it appeared, Medill declared that it was fairly accurate, even to some of the exact language used. This is not remarkable. Whitney was the kind of person, found in many communities, who can reproduce sermons or addresses almost word for word. As we have seen, Lincoln, himself, had this peculiar gift.

Moreover, Whitney's reproduction of the 'Lost Speech' contains most of the arguments made in other speeches which Lincoln wrote during this period, and which were published; and some of the very statements in Whitney's version are found in certain private letters of Lincoln written about that time. Whitney's error was the pretence of presenting Lincoln's performance as a verbatim record, as if taken down in shorthand at the time; whereas it was impossible to give all the precise sentences Lincoln uttered, and, in such a reconstruction, the order of the arguments was likely to be disarranged. But on the whole, Whitney's report of Lincoln's Bloomington speech is as good as, if not better than, that of most speeches made long afterward from long-hand notes and from memory.[1]

Lincoln rose from his seat among the delegates. '*Platform! Take the platform!*' shouted the crowd. Lincoln did so and began with soothing words and tone. He had been impressed by Emery's tale of the wrongs done Free-State men, he said, and he wished to do what was needful to right those wrongs; but, he continued, 'we must not promise what we ought not, lest we

[1] At the celebration, May 29, 1900, of the forty-fifth anniversary of the Bloomington Convention, Ezra M. Prince, Secretary McLean Co. Hist. Socy., got expressions from those who heard Lincoln's speech that Whitney's version was not adequate and that they thought the speech 'still lost.' *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 180.

Gen. Thos. J. Henderson in his address at the celebration said of Whitney's report: 'I do not think it does justice to the speech.' *Ib.*, 82.

Isaac N. Phillips in an irritable 'appendix' to his *Abraham Lincoln*, published at Bloomington, 1901, pugnaciously assails Whitney's version of Lincoln's speech. Aside from saying that various men, all very old, who had heard the speech had told him that Whitney had not reproduced it accurately, Phillips' arguments are: 'The Whitney speech, in style, matter and manner is no more Lincoln's than sweet currant wine is champagne;' Whitney did not print his report of the 'Lost Speech' in his book, *With Lincoln on the Circuit*, although he did publish in that volume his version of Lincoln's speech at Urbana, in 1854, 'which nobody ever heard of,' while the Bloomington speech was celebrated.

be called on to perform what we cannot.' The ballot-box was a better weapon than rifle or knife.

In this peaceable and orderly fashion, public opinion must be registered promptly and with emphasis; for, unless a halt were called to what was going on in Kansas, '*blood will flow, . . . and brother's hand will be raised against brother;*' and Lincoln said this 'in such an earnest, impressive, if not, indeed, tragic manner, as to make a cold chill creep over' Whitney.

A great principle was involved, that of the extension of slavery. The Missouri Compromise must be restored and thus 'Kansas shall be free! [*Immense applause.*] . . . Let our practical work here be limited' to that one object.

Unfortunately, Lincoln admitted, there were disagreements as to other important matters; but he urged that all should act together on the one thing upon which all did agree. So 'bury all resentment, sink all personal feeling' and unite on common ground. '*Slavery must be kept out of Kansas!*' — that was the supreme object, he said.

If it were not accomplished, the outcome would be that 'this land of boasted freedom' would be converted into a land of slavery. ['Sensation.'] See what had already been done by the '*bogus* legislature' of Kansas; they had made it a felony even to tell a negro in that Territory that he was free.

'The party lash and fear of ridicule' would keep men from voting their real sentiments, he continued; 'men who will march up to the mouth of a loaded cannon without shrinking, will run from the terrible name of "Abolitionist."' That was how Douglas had whipped Illinois Democrats into line for his scheme to extend slavery. If that trick should succeed, if free negroes should be made '*things*,' 'how long, think you, before they will begin to make *things* out of poor white men? [Applause.]' Lincoln was here speaking of the idea advanced in Fitzhugh's book and adopted by a few Southern papers,[1] that, economically and morally, slavery was the best condition for labor regardless of color, a position which Lincoln never failed to attack in every speech he made during the campaign now opening.

[1] See Vol. III, Chap. I, 31.

Revolutions did not go backward, Lincoln announced. Jefferson had written that '*all* men were created equal;' Douglas had inserted the adjective '*white*' before the noun 'men;' and might not the Know-Nothings 'add the word "Protestant,"' if they should come into power?

Lincoln then gave most of the arguments made by him in his Peoria Speech, interspersed with thrilling exclamations. 'Murderous violence is being used now in order to force slavery upon Kansas. . . . [*Sensation.*] . . . In Washington, on the very spot where the outrage was started, the fearless Sumner was beaten to insensibility, and is now slowly dying; while senators who claim to be gentlemen and Christians stood by, countenancing the act, and even applauding it afterward in their places in the Senate.

'Even Douglas, our man, saw it all and was within helping distance, yet let the murderous blows fall unopposed. Then, at the other end of the line, at the very time Sumner the man was being murdered, the city of Lawrence was being destroyed for the crime of Freedom.'

If Kansas should come in as a slave State, the border ruffians celebrate their victory with barbecues, and 'the free-State men come trailing back to the dishonored North, like whipped dogs with their tails between their legs,' America would no longer be 'the "land of the Free" and if we let it go so, we won't dare to say "home of the brave" out loud. [*Sensation and confusion.*]'

How had slavery been made legal in Kansas? asked Lincoln. In the same way that 'a gang of Missouri horse-thieves could come into Illinois and declare horse-stealing to be legal,' he explained in a characteristic illustration.

Anti-Nebraska men did not intend to interfere with slavery in the slave States; certainly the anti-Nebraska Whigs did not. Even the Republicans proposed no such thing — 'our platform says just the contrary.' That position was required by the 'necessities of our Union,' he said.

For the same reason, the South must have 'a reasonable and efficient' Fugitive Slave Law, he declared.

'[*A voice!* "*No!*"]'

'I say YES!' thundered Lincoln. [Applause.] 'It was part of the bargain; . . . but I go no further! [Great Applause.]'

The fathers agreed to slavery where it existed and to a Fugitive Slave Law, and that contract must be kept; but they were against extending slavery; and 'it is wise and right to do just as they did about it. [*Voices, Good!*]'

The present troubles were all due to 'this man Douglas.' Yet he would be 'carried in triumph through the State.' That, exclaimed Lincoln, shows 'whither we are tending. [Three groans for "Dug."]'

Why denounce Brooks and the leaders of the Border Ruffians? 'They were mere "cat's-paws" and did only what the Kansas-Nebraska Act made necessary. 'This man Douglas' and his supporters in Congress were 'more guilty than a thousand Joneses and Stringfellows, with all their murderous practices. [*Applause.*]'

It was folly, said Lincoln, to use force against violence, as so many wished to do — at least not now: the Government and, as yet, a majority of the Government and people were still 'against us.'

Do not insist on extreme measures, he counselled: 'as this struggle is likely to be long and earnest, we must not, by our action, repel any who are in sympathy with us in the main, but, rather win all that we can to our standard.'

Calmness and moderation would make converts for the Republicans, the violence of the other side would cause desertions from the Democrats. Be patient! All would come out right if freemen did their duty. Slavery was wrong and, although necessity forced the country to temporize with it now, '*as sure as God reigns and school children read,* THAT BLACK, FOUL LIE CAN NEVER BE CONSECRATED INTO GOD'S HALLOWED TRUTH! [*Immense applause lasting some time.*]' So let all 'unite in harmony,' appeal to the good sense and conscience of the people and rely upon 'their sober second thought.'

The repeal of the 'sacred Missouri Compromise' had necessarily produced 'the bludgeon, the incendiary torch, the death-dealing rifle, the bristling cannon,' and violence of all forms. 'We see its fruits in the dying bed of the heroic Sumner; in the

ruins of the "Free State" hotel; in the smoking embers of the *Herald of Freedom;* in the Free-State Governor of Kansas chained to a stake on freedom's soil like a horse-thief, for the crime of freedom. [Applause.]

'We see it in Christian statesmen, and Christian newspapers, and Christian pulpits applauding the *cowardly act of a low bully,* WHO CRAWLED UPON HIS VICTIM BEHIND HIS BACK AND DEALT HIM THE DEADLY BLOW. [*Sensation and applause.*]'

Nevertheless, retaliation in kind was not the method of final victory: 'let the legions of slavery use bullets; but let us wait patiently till November and fire ballots at them in return.' It was by means of that policy that Illinois had been made free. Never should her prairie winds touch the brow or her 'unfettered' streams lave the foot of a slave; but so long as those breezes blew and waters ran and the cooling groves shed their fragrance, 'the humanity to which they minister SHALL BE FOREVER FREE! [*Great Applause.*]'

Thanks to the Ordinance of 1787, Major's Hall was, to-day, 'a temple for free men instead of a negro livery stable. [*Great applause and laughter.*]' When a horse was stolen, everybody turned out to hang the thief; but if a man, 'but a shade or two darker than I am,' were stolen, the same crowd would hang the person who helped him to liberty. If that were to be done in Kansas, 'the next thing you will see is shiploads of negroes from Africa at the wharf at Charleston; for one thing is as truly lawful as the other; and these are the bastard notions we have got to stamp out, else they will stamp us out. [*Sensation and applause.*] . . .

'Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves; and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it. [*Loud applause.*] . . . If this thing is allowed to continue, it will be but one step further to impress the same rule in Illinois. [*Sensation.*]'

The time must come when 'only local law' rather than the Constitution, can 'shelter a slaveholder,' exclaimed Lincoln. Thus he stated a doctrine often announced by statesmen like Webster and many times repeated by Douglas. For a reaffirmation of that very idea by Douglas two years later, Lincoln was

to make his most successful attack upon the Democratic leader.

At last, Lincoln reached the climax of his speech which had been a well-nigh perfect mingling of appeals to emotion and common sense, a fusing of wise counsel and fighting sentiment. He made the same arguments against disunion and the same reply to the charge that the new party was sectional and would endanger national integrity that we shall hear him make throughout the campaign.

Lincoln ended this part of his speech by saying that loyalty to the Constitution and 'the flag of our Union' was vital, no matter what might happen. That basic rule governed all Americans, South as well as North. Then erect, face flushed, arms flung out, and at the last word, standing 'as if on tiptoe' and as if speaking to Southern disunionists,[1] he cried:

Even if Kansas should come in as a slave State, on the one hand, or the Missouri Compromise should be restored on the other hand, 'WE WILL SAY TO THE SOUTHERN DISUNIONISTS, WE WON'T GO OUT OF THE UNION, AND YOU SHAN'T!!!'

Cheering madly the crowd rose as one man, waving handkerchiefs, throwing hats in air. The floor shook with stamping feet. For several minutes, says Whitney, the tumult 'ran riot.'

Passionately Lincoln pleaded for the election of the ticket. 'Spread the floods of enthusiasm here aroused all over these vast prairies.' Make Bissell Governor — that 'gallant soldier . . . who stood for the honor of our State alike on the plains and amidst the chaparral of Mexico, and on the floor of Congress, where he defied the Southern Hotspur.'[2] To do that, would 'have a greater moral effect than all the border ruffians can accomplish in all their raids on Kansas.'

Calm and reasonable appeal to public opinion would, in all probability, make unnecessary a 'resort to force;' but, in any event, 'our moderation and forbearance will stand us in good stead when, if ever, WE MUST MAKE AN APPEAL TO BATTLE AND TO THE GOD OF HOSTS!!!'[3]

[1] Henderson in *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 81.

[2] Lincoln here made reference to the threatened duel between Bissell and Davis. See Vol. III, 116 *n.*

[3] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 327–54. Appendix III. Italics and capitals Whitney's.

Again the Convention 'went wild.' The throng rushed to Lincoln. All struggled to shake his hand.

As long as Herndon lived, he contended that Lincoln's speech was 'the grand effort of his life. . . . At Bloomington that day he was seven feet' high.[1] Whitney's enthusiasm was equally extreme and lasting: 'when the majestic Lincoln, . . . defined clearly the duties of the hour; and then, with a mien and gesture no language can describe, exclaimed, . . . "we *won't* go out of the Union: and you SHAN'T:" the effect was thrilling: . . . No language can convey any conception of it.' [2]

That seasoned journalist, John L. Scripps, bore like testimony, and he also stated the result, to get which was Lincoln's whole purpose: 'Never was an audience more completely electrified by human eloquence. . . . It fused the mass of hitherto incongruous elements into perfect homogeneity.' [3]

Even the sullen Dubois was wrought up: 'Whitney, that is the greatest speech ever made in Illinois and it puts Lincoln on the track for the Presidency,' said Dubois, as the crowd was leaving the hall.

Walking away together, Whitney told Lincoln of Dubois's prophecy. For a time Lincoln was abstracted, and then made a casual remark. But some of his friends thought that, from that moment, the Presidency was in his mind.[4]

Next morning the delegates were still loud in praise and wrung the orator's hand with strong grasp. 'Lincoln, I never swear, but that was the damndest best speech I ever heard,' exclaimed one of them, William Hopkins of Grundy County.[5]

With pride the *State Journal* [6] quoted an editorial from the *Chicago Press:* 'Abraham Lincoln of Springfield . . . made *the* speech of the occasion. . . . For an hour and a half he held the assembly spellbound. . . . When he concluded the audience sprang to their feet, and cheer after cheer told how deeply their hearts had been touched, and their souls warmed.' The country press said the same thing. Lincoln's 'wonderful eloquence electrified the audience of two thousand men.' [7]

[1] Herndon, II, 384. [2] Whitney, 76–7. [3] *Ib.*, 77. [4] *Ib.*, 77–8.

[5] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 261. [6] June 3, 1856.

[7] *Belleville Advocate*, June 4, 1856.

This was the estimate of Lincoln's speech which most who heard it retained through-

Anti-Nebraska papers laid emphasis on the 'remarkable unanimity' of the Convention.[1] 'We never saw such harmony. . . . Not a ballot was cast.'[2] No wonder, retorted Democratic editors; since the assemblage had been managed by 'sharp lawyers' and 'controlled by Know Nothings.'[3] The ticket was made up of a renegade Democrat, a German nondescript and Know-Nothings, declared the *State Register*.[4] 'We committed Palmer fully,' an enthusiast of the new party gleefully wrote to Trumbull.[5]

Northern Illinois heartily endorsed the Bloomington platform and nominees. On the night of May 31 a great Kansas meeting was held in the Court-House square in Chicago. The New York *Tribune* said: 'The prairies are all ablaze.'[6] Although the announced purpose of the gathering was to express sympathy for the Free State men of Kansas and contribute money to help them, it also turned into a Republican ratification meeting, although the word 'Republican' was not used in the resolutions or by any speaker.

Judd presided. Hoffman, the Bloomington candidate for Lieutenant Governor, spoke first. Judd had captured 'Egan and that crowd of Irishmen,' as he had told Trumbull he would do if Know-Nothingism were rejected at Bloomington, and the Irish orator spoke next. But Lane made the speech of the occa-

out life. For instance: 'I have always believed it to have been the greatest speech Mr. Lincoln ever made, and the greatest speech to which I ever listened.' General Thos. J. Henderson in *Trans. McLean Co. Hist. Socy.*, III, 81 (May 29, 1900).

John Cockle, of New York, who was at the Bloomington Convention, told Henderson at the time that he had heard Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and others and that he 'had never before heard from any one so great a speech as the one just delivered by Mr. Lincoln.' *Ib.*, 82.

'I thought it then a great speech and I now (May 29, 1900) think it . . . one of the greatest . . . ever delivered by him.' J. O. Cunningham in *ib.*, 93.

On the other hand, Browning in his *Diary* makes no mention of anything more striking in Lincoln's speech than in that of other speakers: 'the Convention was very large, harmonious and enthusiastic. I was called out and made two speeches in the afternoon. Convention also addressed by Lovejoy, Lincoln, Cook and others.' Browning, I, 238 (May 29, 1856).

Judd, in his report to Trumbull of the Bloomington Convention, did not even mention Lincoln. Judd to Trumbull, June 7, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[1] *Quincy Whig*, June 7, 1856. [2] *Bloomington Pantagraph*, June 4, 1856.

[3] *Ottawa Free Trader*, July 26, 1856. [4] June 12, 1856.

[5] G. T. Brown, Alton, Ill., to Trumbull, June 3, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[6] Chicago Correspondence, New York *Tribune*, June 1, in issue June 5, 1856.

sion — perhaps the strongest he ever made. Experienced newspaper reporters, as well as other spectators, frankly said that they could give no adequate description of the effect of it.

'Were the rope about my neck, I would say that as to the Kansas code it shall not be enforced — never, NEVER! . . . Before God and this people, I arraign Frank Pierce as a murderer! . . . I was side by side with your gallant and noble Bissell at Buena Vista. . . . It did not occur to me then that I should be indicted for treason because I loved liberty better than slavery.' Thus spoke Lane for more than an hour, weaving argument, fact, inference, misstatement, and theatrical exclamation into an appeal that aroused the crowd to frenzy. Cheers broke out like thunder, died down, rose and pealed again. Fifteen thousand dollars were raised in cash, and many revolvers, balls, cans of powder and Sharp's rifles, some of them 'with double barrels, sure at each pop,' were given by the excited and bellicose hearers.[1]

The Chicago affair was typical of Kansas Republican meetings held in Northern Illinois and in sections of like mind and feeling throughout the North during the campaign before us. In such communities, a Kansas meeting was a Republican meeting and a Republican meeting was a Kansas meeting. In all, the dominant note was warlike. Vast sums were raised. The total is not known, nor what was done with the money. If the amounts reported in some newspapers form a basis for judgment, more than a million of dollars was given. Certainly all of it did not go to Kansas.[2]

[1] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 2, 1856, as quoted in *History of the State of Kansas:* A. T. Andreas, 136–7. Also, Peter Page to Trumbull, Chicago, June 3, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[2] For example: $104.50 given by employees of a reaper factory at Aurora, Ill., *Aurora Guardian*, March 13; $400 at a church meeting., *ib.*, June 5; $300 West Urbana, *Our Constitution*, Sept. 13; $1000 Ottawa, *Rockford Republican*, May 28; Rockford, $1000 raised and $3000 more pledged, *Rockford Register*, June 14; $2000 Quincy, *Herald of Freedom*, Feb. 16.

Such items in the press all over the North were numerous. The Democrats charged that part of these funds was kept by the Kansas agitators who made the principal appeals at most money-raising meetings; reports of talks among them, private but overheard, to that effect were published. *Illinois Daily State Register*, Feb. 20, 1856.

Democratic papers in Illinois asserted that Delahay sold to Minnesota papers the press and type bought with money given him to re-establish the *Territorial Register* at Leavenworth, Kansas. *Ib.*, Oct. 20, quoting the *St. Paul Pioneer Press.*

Professor Channing says that much of this money was spent in keeping up the Kansas propaganda in the North during the campaign. Channing to author, Aug. 16, 1926.

In Central Illinois, however, there was a different temper, and in Springfield old line Whigs were angry. Stuart, Lincoln's first partner, earliest Springfield friend, political guide and chieftain, and his relative by marriage, was outspoken against the new party. So was James H. Matheny, once Lincoln's intimate, and his 'best man' at his wedding. Throughout the middle and southern part of the State, many of Lincoln's strongest friends of former days denounced the 'fusion' in unsparing terms.

As soon as they reached Springfield after the Convention Herndon got up a ratification meeting. Big handbills were circulated announcing that Lincoln would speak at the Court House, and Herndon hired a band to play at the door.[1] Nobody came except the partners and the janitor, John Pain. The meeting was larger than he knew it would be, Lincoln whimsically said; he did not think the janitor would stay.[2]

Gillespie, in Edwardsville, was suspicious of the good faith of the anti-Nebraska Democrats at Bloomington. He wrote Lincoln a very long letter stating his doubts, and the reason for them. 'I have my fears that the so-called Democrats at the Bloomington Convention are going for Buchanan and that it will turn out to be a clean sell of the Whigs and true conservative men of the State. . . . If this is the game, I am for a thorough organization for Fillmore and Donelson whether we sink or swim. They are honest and conservative men and it would be more creditable to fail fighting under that banner than to triumph in such company as I fear some of the wire workers at Bloomington are.'

Gillespie could not get over Lincoln's defeat for the Senate by the very men now at the forefront of the new party. 'I am tired of being dragooned by some half dozen men who are determined to either rule or ruin. I am out of all temper with, and have no faith in the honesty of, men who insist that ten Whigs

[1] Whitney, 372.

[2] Herndon, II, 385; Whitney, 372.

Herndon spoke at other ratification meetings in the district. He reported that although the crowds were silent, they showed '*deep seated*' feeling. He thought there would be a '*stampede*' to the new party. Herndon to Trumbull, June 16, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

shall go with one Democrat because they cannot in conscience vote for a Whig. Though I am well satisfied with Trumbull, yet his five particular friends who would rather see the country go to the Devil than to vote for a Whig are not at all to my taste. I have made up my mind that henceforth I can be as reckless as they are, and, *so help me God*, they shall find out that I am one as well as either of them.' [1]

Such was the feeling of old line Whigs like Gillespie who had not joined the new party, but who were close to Lincoln. He never did overcome the prejudices of men like these; nor, as we shall presently see, could he move tens of thousands of his former partisans, although he tried his best to win them.

The state of mind of these Whigs who repudiated the Republican Party, who in angry protest against it finally went into the Democratic Party, and who now were, and continued to be, an important factor in Lincoln's career, is perfectly set out in a long letter by one of Lincoln's oldest, staunchest, and ablest friends, Edward B. Webb of White County: [2]

'I don't sympathize with that black republican movement, in any way, shape, manner or form,' wrote Webb to a Whig associate. 'Its temporary success would only end in an application of some fresh mouths to the public udder. . . . Its permanent success would surely end in the dissolution of this Union.' The result would be that there would be 'neither wheel nor spindle south of Mason & Dixon's line, but, instead, . . . gorgeous French and British embassies, and, at need, French and British friendly bayonets, . . . I hate slaves and slavery. . . . If it had but one neck, I would peril my precious soul by striking the blow which would annihilate it. But this *can't* be done. . . . I am tired of political strife and turmoil. My old friends, as a body, wanted patience, perseverance, and discipline, and there-

[1] Gillespie to Lincoln, June 6, 1856. Weik MSS. 'I was disposed at first to remain quiet, or even acquiesce in the nominations made at Bloomington if that would most conduce to an union against the Nullifiers; but I shall wait now and see what the future will bring forth. Let me hear from you as soon as practicable.'

[2] As we have seen, Lincoln had had relations with Webb while in the Legislature. Webb had been the Whig candidate for Governor in the Scott campaign of 1852, and Lincoln had earnestly supported him.

fore failed. They will carry these same merits to their new friends, and *fail again*.' [1]

Chagrined by the collapse of Herndon's premature ratification meeting, friends of the new party in Sangamon County got up another a fortnight later. Two hundred persons attended. The Democratic organ said that one-third of them were Democrats who went to see the 'gyrations' of Lincoln, Palmer, and Yates who had been announced as the speakers. Lincoln made his usual arguments, although 'under much restraint,' reported the *State Register*. He would start to say something strong, but, looking into the cold eyes of the old Whigs before him, 'he would soften his remarks to a supposed palatable texture. . . . His timidity before the peculiar audience he addressed prevented earnest advocacy with the power and ability he is known to possess.'

However, Lincoln did announce that 'there could be no Union with slavery. The agitation would be ceaseless until it shall be swept away.' But he cautiously avoided saying anything about restoring the Missouri Compromise or denying the admission of new slave States, and we shall presently hear him assert that the Missouri Compromise could not be reënacted. Lincoln laid especial emphasis upon the fact that the Bloomington ticket represented all factions opposed to the Administration Democracy. 'Mr. Lincoln's remarks were received with coldness,' declared the hostile Springfield paper. [2]

The *State Journal*, on the other hand, asserted that 'the Court House was filled to overflowing,' that many stood in the aisles for hours and that others were turned away. Lincoln made the 'most logical and finished' argument the editor ever had heard; but, said he, 'we shall not mar its beauty by an attempt to give a synopsis of it.' Lincoln's manner was 'calm and unimpassioned, he preferring rather to appeal to the reason than to excite the feelings of his hearers.' [3]

[1] Webb to an old Whig friend, May 23, 1856. *Illinois State Register*, June 10, 1856. Italics Webb's.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 12 and July 4, 1856, of Lincoln at Decatur where he made the same speech. 'Most truly did Lovejoy predict in the Bloomington Convention that "*although the friends did not take abolition by inoculation, yet before the campaign is over they will be all broke out with it.*"' Italics *Register's*.

[3] *Illinois State Journal*, June 11, 1856, adding that the meeting was to ratify 'the nomi-

Recalling Lincoln's speech a month later, the editor of a campaign Whig paper then recently started, deplored it. 'Shortly after his return from the Bloomington Convention, we heard him. . . . We were not only surprised but sorry. . . . Surprised that a man of his acknowledged ability would indulge so thin and bold a piece of sophistry and sorry that a man, of his dignity of character, would descend to such pettyfogging demagogueism. . . . These thoughts and feelings we shared in common, with all Mr. Lincoln's old and long tried friends, those who stood by him in the days of his early struggles; those who had "breathed into him the political breath of life," those who had delighted at all times and everywhere to do him honor.' [1]

Coldness and hostility to the new party in Springfield and throughout central and southern Illinois, except in the German counties, were not relieved by the nominations and platform of the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia, which, however, was called 'The People's Convention,' even by the New York *Tribune*.[2] As we have seen, the Know-Nothings early in the year had adopted their platform and made their presidential nomination. The platform was a mixture of piety and patriotism and intensely 'American.'

'Americans must rule America;' Congress must not interfere with the affairs of the States; citizens, whether native or foreign born 'permanently residing in any Territory,' must be allowed to frame their own laws in their own way; emigrants must live here twenty-one years before they could vote; and foreign paupers and criminals must absolutely be kept out.[3]

Upon this declaration of principles and policies, the regular Know-Nothings had placed Fillmore and Donelson as the standard bearers of the American Party. Fillmore was fifty-six years old and was esteemed by conservative Union men all over the country. He was a man of fine personal character, had

nations of the People's Anti-Nebraska convention.' The name Republican was carefully avoided by that paper and by Lincoln throughout the campaign.

[1] The *Conservative*, Aug. 21, 1856.

[2] June 20, 1856. Throughout the North, and especially in Illinois and Indiana during the campaign of 1856, the new party was usually called 'People's.' For instance, the party organ in Indianapolis, in a leading editorial, termed the Republican ticket the '*People's State Ticket*.' *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, July 24, 1856.

[3] McKee, 100–2.

long been at the head of the leading law firm in Western New York, and had had a typical American career of uncommon success. He had been a member of the Legislature, a Representative in Congress for eight years, Comptroller of his State, Vice President and President. Abolition of imprisonment for debt, the tariff of 1842, cheap postage, the Perry treaty with Japan, the suppression of filibustering, and avoidance of foreign entanglements, were some of his achievements.

Lincoln had preferred Fillmore to Scott as the Whig candidate for President in 1852, and, if we may judge by what Lincoln said in letters and speeches then and thereafter, Fillmore had given the same administration that Lincoln would have given had he been President at that time.

Four days after the Bloomington Convention, delegates of the National Democracy had assembled at Cincinnati. For several days they and crowds of spectators had been coming to that city. The anti-Administration press used hard words in describing the throng. The Democratic Convention met, said the *Illinois State Journal*, 'under the impressive auspices of pistols and bowie knives, bludgeons and terrorism, and is graced by the company of five hundred gamblers and blacklegs, and from three to four hundred women of the town, gathered from the stews of most of our large cities, and all revelling together as in the festivities of a common jubilee.' And no wonder, for the Democratic Party had 'fallen under the control of the nigger drivers of the south.' [1]

Benton stated that the Democratic Convention met in a hall like the black hole of Calcutta, the only light and air coming from a row of small windows thirty-five feet above the floor; the doors were guarded by 'armed bullies' brought on from the 'Five Points in New York;' the delegates were officeholders and political offscourings.[2] In short, the Democratic National Convention of 1856 was held up to the people as a drunken, violent, shameless mob of ruffians and prostitutes.

The candidates were James Buchanan, Pierce, and Douglas. For months many Democratic politicians and newspapers had

[1] *New York Herald*, June 4, clipped in *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 10, 1856.
[2] Benton's speech to his constituents. *Liberator*, July 11, 1856.

advocated the nomination of the Pennsylvania statesman, largely because of his availability. He had been abroad as Minister to Great Britain when the Kansas-Nebraska law was enacted and during the whole Kansas struggle. Although a Democratic Convention in his State had declared for him for President, there had been no general organization for him.[1] The *Washington Sentinel* had announced in January that Douglas would not be a candidate.[2] He did not want the nomination that year because of the storm against him.[3] But the popular Democratic heart was with the 'Little Giant,'[4] and a spontaneous movement among the delegates developed for him. Pierce had the Administration vote which was almost wholly confined to delegates from the South.

Yet so strong was Douglas sentiment that his nomination would have been 'inevitable' had the whole New York delegation, which was for him, been seated. Through the efforts of Senator James A. Bayard of Delaware, Senator John Slidell of Louisiana, and other moderate men, the New York vote was equally divided between contesting delegations; and this action, together with other astute manœuvring of those accomplished politicians, finally secured the nomination of Buchanan on the seventeenth ballot.[5] But to the last, the South Carolina delegates did all they could to defeat him.[6] For Vice President, a young man, John Cabell Breckinridge of Kentucky, was nominated unanimously on the second ballot.[7]

[1] S. L. M. Barlow's statement in *Life of James Buchanan:* George Ticknor Curtis, II, 170–3.

[2] Jan. 26, 1856. 'He neither desires nor would he accept the nomination.'

[3] *Richmond Enquirer*, clipped in *Washington Tri-Weekly Sentinel*, Feb. 12, 1856.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Register*, Feb. 28, 1856. 'He has a place in the hearts of our people which no other man ever had.'

[5] Barlow's statement in Curtis, II, 170–3. On the first ballot Douglas received thirty-three votes (the solid Illinois delegation), Pierce one hundred and twenty-two and Buchanan one hundred and thirty-five. Douglas and Buchanan gained and Pierce lost until the sixteenth, when the bulk of Pierce's strength went to Douglas while some of it went to Buchanan; so that the vote stood one hundred and sixty-eight for Buchanan and one hundred and twenty-one for Douglas. Douglas had written from Washington asking the withdrawal of his name (*Washington Tri-Weekly Sentinel*, June 10, 1856) and, on the seventeenth ballot, Buchanan was given the full vote of the convention — 296. McKee, 87.

[6] *Charleston Mercury*, clipped in *Alexandria Gazette*, June 27, 1856.

[7] McKee, 88. Breckinridge was then thirty-five years old. He was a graduate of

Few Americans have had a more extended and distinguished career than Buchanan had had up to the time he was made the Democratic candidate for President in 1856. A graduate of Dickinson College, he was elected to the Legislature and then to Congress which he entered as a Federalist, but speedily became a Jackson Democrat. At forty-one, he was Minister to Russia, and, while at St. Petersburg, was elected to the Senate. He was twice reëlected to that body by increased majorities, and during his service he made some notable and very able speeches.

As Secretary of State under Polk, Buchanan showed that aggressive nationalism then called 'the spirit of Young America.' He deplored and condemned the anti-slavery agitation, and was as much for the Fugitive Slave Law as Lincoln was. He opposed Scott for President on the ground that a professional soldier was not fit to be the supreme administrator of civil affairs, and that thus to elevate a popular military hero was unwise and dangerous in a republic. Pierce appointed Buchanan as Minister to Great Britain; but he declined at first, and finally accepted only upon the insistence of the President.

At the time of his nomination, Buchanan was in his sixty-sixth year. Old, weary, and far from well, he was unfitted for the crushing responsibility and incessant hard work, from which no President could have escaped during the four desperate years that preceded the war. He did not expect to be nominated, and it is not certain that he wanted the office at that time. Above all things, Buchanan was devoted to the Union, and he thought that the Constitution, which he construed much as Jefferson had done, was well-nigh sacred.

When a young man, he had fallen in love and became engaged, but his fiancée died. Buchanan never recovered from that blow and remained unmarried. The fact that he was a bachelor was used against him with telling effect among North-

Transylvania University, a lawyer, had served as a major in the Mexican War, and for four years had been a Representative in Congress, where he had won an uncommonly brilliant reputation. In 1861 he was elected to the Senate as the successor of Crittenden, but was one of those expelled from the Senate for treason in December of that year. He entered the Confederate Army as Brigadier General, rose to be a Major General, and became Confederate Secretary of War.

ern women, who became an active and militant factor in the campaign we are now to review. His early bereavement, his stainless private life, his care of his sister's children after her death, the correctness and warmth of his household at the head of which was his niece, Harriet Lane — all this weighed as nothing against the charge that Buchanan was 'a crusty, musty old bachelor.' Indeed, the facts of his private life were not known — not asked for.

Such was the man drafted to carry the Democratic standard in 1856, and whose administration was to precede and to be interwoven inextricably with that of Lincoln. Under the leadership of this tired and aged man, the National Democracy was to make its last fight before the Civil War.

The Democratic platform stated the grounds upon which that fight was to be made. The traditional Democratic policies were again set out — for States' Rights, for economy, for the Presidential veto, for early naturalization of immigrants and facilitation of their opportunities to get farms of their own, against monopolies, against a National Bank, against a discriminating tariff, against internal improvements, as a system, by the National Government — but for the building of Pacific railways under the power of Congress to construct military and post roads.

The preservation of the Union under the Constitution was the 'paramount issue,' declared the Democrats; and they therefore denounced and repudiated 'all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery which seek to embroil the states and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the territories, and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion.' This was made the chief battle cry of the Democrats throughout the campaign.

The principles of the Kansas-Nebraska Act were specifically adopted as those of the Democratic Party; and 'NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN STATE AND TERRITORY, OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,' was declared to be a fundamental article of the Democratic creed.[1]

Next to their arraignment of a sectional party as a certain

[1] Capitals those of the platform.

cause of disunion and war, the strongest appeal to voters made by the Democrats was their declaration on foreign affairs, which, ran the platform, 'are inferior to no domestic question whatever.' The freedom of the seas, the rigid enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, exclusive American control of an Isthmian canal — 'which no power on earth should be suffered to impede or clog' — and American 'ascendency in the Gulf of Mexico,' were vital to American interests and required by America's geographical situation on the globe. If anything could have recalled to their old party insurgent Democrats like Trumbull, Palmer, and Judd, this pronouncement on American foreign policy would have done it. As late as two years after Palmer had joined the Republican Party, he wrote to Trumbull for a stronger foreign and expansionist policy than even the Democratic platform of 1856 endorsed.[1]

With the Know-Nothings and the Democrats thus in the field, the first National Republican Convention met at Philadelphia on June 17, 1856. It contained much the same elements as the Bloomington Convention; the chief difference was that the anti-slavery radicals were far more numerous and bolder — in fact, they may be said almost to have dominated the Philadelphia gathering. Men like Giddings, Lovejoy, and Codding were conspicuous, determined, insistent. Many preachers were delegates or active attendants, and their talk was continuous and loud.

Order and decorum were as much features of the assemblage as were earnestness and fighting spirit. The friendly press made the most of the sobriety and system of this 'People's Convention,' as it was called, in contrast to what that press had described as the whisky-drinking, women-carousing turbulence of those who went to the Democratic Convention at Cincinnati. That at Philadelphia was, said a spectator, like a 'Methodist conference.' [2]

The Convention was held in Music Fund Hall. It was the largest auditorium in Philadelphia, and was crowded with dele-

[1] 'Manifest destiny gives us Mexico. It will come and let us take the lead in its acquisition.' Palmer to Trumbull, Dec. 9, 1858. Trumbull MSS. These MSS. contain other letters to the same effect.

[2] Eldridge, 65–6.

gates and spectators at every session. Sumner's speech and the House Committee's report on the Brooks assault, the report of the Kansas Investigating Committee, and other partisan and inflammatory documents, were circulated among delegates and visitors.

The Convention was overwhelmingly sectional. Only four border slave States were represented, and these but sparingly.[1] No rule had been observed in choosing delegates, all who came were seated, and States like New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, sent absurdly large numbers.[2] Robert Emmet of New York was made temporary chairman and Henry S. Lane of Indiana permanent chairman. Stirring speeches were delivered, excitement ran high, the great hall rang with cheers.

The reading of the platform by David Wilmot aroused as much enthusiasm as did the most eloquent speeches. In comparison with the Democratic platform it was short, and every sentence was as direct and deadly as a rifle shot. The new party stood against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, against the extension of slavery, for the admission of Kansas as a free State and for the restoration in government of 'the principles of Washington and Jefferson,' the brief preamble said.

The object and design of the 'federal government' were to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all persons under its exclusive jurisdiction; and neither Congress nor territorial legislature could establish slavery in any Territory. Congress had 'sovereign power' over the government of territories, and should keep out of them 'those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy, and slavery.'

The longest plank in the platform was on Kansas. It was a terrible indictment. Drums of war beat and bayonets gleamed in every line of it. Although the Constitution gave ample power to prevent such outrages, the 'dearest constitutional rights' of Kansans had been taken from them by violence and fraud; Kansas had suffered armed invasion; 'spurious' officials, upheld by Federal military power, had inflicted 'tyrannical and un-

[1] Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky. McKee, 97.

[2] New York, ninety-six, Pennsylvania, eighty-one, Ohio, sixty-nine, etc. McKee, 96–7.

constitutional laws' upon the people; the right to bear arms, to speedy and impartial jury trial, to security from unreasonable search and seizure, to due process of law, to freedom of speech and press, and similar rights, had been ruthlessly denied; 'murders, robberies and arsons' had been perpetrated — even encouraged — without punishment; all this had been done 'with the knowledge, sanction, and procurement of the present administration. . . .

'For this high crime against the Constitution, the Union, and humanity, we arraign the administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists, and accessories either *before* or *after* the fact, before the country and before the world. . . . It is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious outrages, and their accomplices, to a sure and condign punishment.'

When the reading of the Kansas plank came to an end, a tremendous demonstration was made. The sound of deep-throated huzzas rolled out of the hall and was heard blocks away. The band played and the roar of applause recurred and swelled again and again, earnest, fearful, portentous. It pealed forth once more when the declaration that Kansas must be 'immediately admitted as a State of the Union, with her present free Constitution' was read.

Cheers also were given when the 'Ostend Circular' was denounced as 'the highwayman's plea, that "might makes right."' But expansionist Democrats, like Palmer, who had joined the new party solely because they opposed the extension of slavery, were not ardent for this Cuban plank. It was a blow at Buchanan and, largely, a matter of politics.

The 'Ostend Circular' or 'Manifesto' was a document prepared and signed by the American Ministers to Spain, France, and Great Britain as a report which Secretary of State Marcy had directed them to make on Spain and Cuba.[1] Since before the Revolution, the acquisition of that island had been a general and ever-growing American hope and desire; there had long been trouble between the United States and Spain on account of Cuba; and in 1854 an aggravating action by Spanish authorities

[1] Pierre Soulé, John Young Mason and James Buchanan.

in Havana had brought matters to a head. But seizure of Cuba was now said to be a part of the Slave Power's extravagant plan of expansion southward to strengthen and extend the empire of bondage; and in this charge there was some truth. So when the three American Ministers met at Ostend, in Belgium, and wrote, signed, and published a report in which they advised that the American Government should offer to buy Cuba for a large sum, and, if Spain would not sell, should seize the island forthwith, anti-slavery, anti-Southern and anti-Administration men and newspapers denounced the 'Ostend Manifesto' in a great rage. In this wise came the Ostend plank in the Republican platform. It is not impossible that, in the campaign and at the elections, that inept political manœuvre hurt the new party, for, as we have seen, the wish for territorial expansion was very strong among the people, and was especially rampant in the West and South.

Roaring approval met the declarations that the National Government must give 'immediate and efficient aid' to the building of a Pacific railroad by the 'most central' route, and that Congress must appropriate all money needed to improve rivers and harbors. The cheering that greeted the reading of these planks was only less than that which burst out when the militant Kansas plank was read.

Indeed, the forthright assertion that the Republicans were for local improvements that would cost scores of millions to be paid by the general government, and for the building in the same way of a Pacific railroad, 'over the most central route,' was a powerful appeal to voters all over the North and West. The President had just vetoed the River and Harbor bill which carried large appropriations for many 'improvements' and the disappointment of expectant contractors and of water transportation interests was vindictive and great; and the people who wanted to ship products cheaply and travel in safety were irritated and angry.[1]

[1] Pierce vetoed five such bills in May, 1856 (*Messages:* Richardson, v, 386–8), on the ground that they provided for needless expenditure of money and were unconstitutional. For the President's constitutional argument against appropriations by Congress for such purposes, see *Ib.*, 257–71.

The vetoes in 1856 were quite impartial. The first was for opening the mouth of the

To please the Germans, a short, mild plank, vague in its generalization, was inserted against Know-Nothingism, calling for 'liberty of conscience and equality of rights among citizens.'

The candidate for President had been settled in advance, almost as much, and in the same way, as the nomination of Bissell for Governor at Bloomington. The outstanding leaders of the new party, like Seward and Chase, did not want to captain that craft on its trial voyage, and they refused to be candidates. But there was one man who was eager for the place, and he was, and for years had been, the most talked of person in the country. John C. Frémont had made five journeys across the Western plains and over the mountains, trips full of picturesque adventure, desperate incident, imminent peril.

The conquest of California and its admission as a free state, the survey of various routes to the Pacific — these achievements were inseparably connected in the public mind with the name of Frémont. Stories of his experiences were dramatic and thrilling — Indian attacks, fights with bears, defiance of Mexican troops, golden sands, Pikes Peak, snow, cold, storm; and these tales, written in sensational style and illustrated by pictures of daring, hazard, and triumph, had been read and admired all over the country, especially by young people.[1]

And Frémont was against the extension of slavery — opposed to slavery itself, indeed. He was the son-in-law of Benton; had been Senator from California for a few months, and had not mixed in politics. He was forty-three years old and in robust health. In short, Frémont was looked upon as just the man to lead the new party in its first foray. Months before the Philadelphia Convention, that astute and seasoned politician, Francis P. Blair, Jr., one of Benton's strongest supporters, had put forward the name of 'the Pathfinder' as the most available candidate.

Mississippi River, the money to be spent under the direction of the Secretary of War (Jefferson Davis); the last, for the port of Baltimore, under Davis; and another for St. Mary's River, Mich., ardently supported by Cass.

In the Senate, Mason of Virginia defended these vetoes, because the bills were scrambles for public money as well as unconstitutional; and he gave a list of such bills then being urged upon Congress. *Cong. Globe*, 34th Cong. 1st Sess., 1320–4, May 28, 1856.

[1] Many campaign biographies of Frémont were published, most of them embellished with exciting illustrations. The shortest and best, but without pictures, was by Greeley.

So skilfully was this done, that the response appeared to be spontaneous. Here and there all over the North, favorable mention of Frémont was made in the anti-Administration press. Newspapers began to come out for him. He was not objectionable to the Know-Nothings — in fact, rumor falsely said that he was one of them. Yet, most curiously, the German papers were among the earliest to urge his nomination. He had known Robinson in California and the two men were fast friends. In March, Frémont had written for publication a letter to the Kansas 'Governor' ardently supporting the Free-State Party.[1] Forthwith the *Herald of Freedom* had declared for Frémont and carried his name at the head of its editorial column.[2] Frémont, though brought on the stage by anti-Atchison Democrats of Missouri, was the Kansas candidate; and in the Convention her delegation voted solidly for him.[3]

But Lincoln opposed him.[4] He would have done so in any case, almost by instinct; for Frémont's strongest characteristics were those which Lincoln did not like or trust — impulsiveness, insubordination, over-gallantry, dash. But the conservative Illinois Whig who so tardily had become a Republican had a concrete and immediate reason for his stand: Frémont could not get the stubborn old line Whigs, and it was Lincoln's particular task to herd them into the Republican Party, which, however, he steadfastly refused to call by that name.

So a few days before the Philadelphia Convention — indeed, the very moment he received Gillespie's complaining letter — Lincoln wrote Trumbull that the man to nominate for President was Justice John McLean of the National Supreme Court, a judge, said Wendell Phillips, who had 'made more pro-slavery law on the bench than all the pro-slavery judges put together.'[5]

[1] Frémont to Robinson, March 17, 1856. *Herald of Freedom*, April 12, 1856. This letter was republished everywhere. *Liberator*, April 18, 1856.

[2] 'OUR CANDIDATE: JOHN C. FRÉMONT,' *Herald of Freedom*, April 12, 1856, *et seq.* The Emigrant Aid Company's organ had been praising Frémont for more than a year. Jan. 20, 1855, it published a long and extravagantly laudatory article about him.

[3] Eldridge, 65–6.

[4] 'We were not in favor of Frémont's nomination.' *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Nov. 19, 1856.

[5] Phillips' speech at New England Anti-Slavery Convention, Boston, May 27, 1856, in full in the *Liberator*, June 6, 1856.

Many Whigs were inclined to go for Buchanan, Lincoln asserted, 'and will do it, unless the Anti-Nebraska nomination shall be such as to divert them.' McLean's nomination 'would save every Whig, except such as have already gone over, hook and line.' Even Stuart, and others like him, might go for McLean, but would support Buchanan if Frémont headed the ticket. 'They would stand Blair or Frémont for Vice President — but not more.'

It was a serious question, Lincoln insisted. 'Nine tenths of the Anti-Nebraska votes have to come from old Whigs' — the new party could not possibly win if they were 'disregarded.' Of course, Lincoln, himself, would not desert, although he was none too stanch; 'I am *in*, and shall go for any one nominated unless he be "*platformed*" expressly, or impliedly, on some ground which I may think wrong.' [1]

Nineteen of the Illinois delegation felt as Lincoln did, yet fourteen were for Frémont. But strive as they might, the Illinois McLean delegates and other conservative men, all of them former Whigs and most of them Know-Nothings, could do little against the storm of radical sentiment for 'the Little Mustang.' [2] 'The Democrats ruled the Convention,' testifies Koerner who was an onlooker.

McLean's name was first presented, and next that of Frémont. A tremendous outburst of enthusiasm greeted it. Then up rose a tall, robust old German, Philip Dorscheimer, son of a miller in Rhenish Hesse, and, 'with greatest unconcern,' speaking broken English, shouted 'in a stentorian voice:' 'I am a plain old German — no politician — but I can tell this assembly that I know my countrymen, and they will vote for no one more cheerfully than for John C. Frémont, who is well known to them as the pathfinder, and the one who first planted the Stars and Stripes on the face of Mexican California.' [3]

So on the informal or test ballot three hundred and fifty-nine votes were cast for Frémont to only one hundred and ninety-six

[1] Lincoln to Trumbull, June 7, 1856. Tracy, 66–8. Italics Lincoln's.

[2] On the 'informal' ballot fourteen Illinois delegates voted for Frémont and nineteen for McLean. New York *Tribune*, June 19, 1856; *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, July 5, 1856.

[3] Koerner, II, 15–6.

for McLean, and on the formal ballot the Pathfinder was nominated by acclamation.[1] The band played, flags waved, hysterical cheers shook the hall. 'The enthusiasm is tremendous,' Greeley wired to his paper, while the demonstration was going on.[2] More speeches followed, among them many by Germans.[3]

Although it was not clear to what party the Presidential nominee had belonged, the Convention thought that he was an old line Democrat. Therefore an old line Whig must be named for Vice President. Moreover, any candidate would be chosen who was acceptable to the McLean men.[4] Several persons had been talked of for the place, but sentiment had crystallized for Senator William L. Dayton of New Jersey, an old line Whig who had had 'a quasi connection with the Americans.' [5]

One of the Illinois delegation was Colonel William B. Archer, who had been in the Legislature when Lincoln was the Whig leader in the House. Few men in the State had been and were stronger friends of Lincoln than he. Archer was an old line Whig and a Know-Nothing, and had recently withdrawn as the 'American' nominee for Governor and thrown his lot with the new party.[6] Disgusted and angry over McLean's defeat, he resolved to nominate Lincoln for Vice President 'regardless [of] whom they might name.' So he hastened to the Girard House where the Illinois delegation stopped,[7] saw Trumbull, Palmer, Judd, and the other delegates.

They 'said Amen' to Archer's proposal, and from eight o'clock to midnight all worked hard for Lincoln among the delegates of other States. They made headway. Archer thought that they would have succeeded had they begun earlier. But too many delegates had been pledged to Dayton, and 'Ohio and Iowa treated me badly,' Archer reported to Lincoln. Still he got a Pennsylvania delegate of the name of John Allison to agree to present Lincoln's name to the Convention next morning.[8]

That body was in a happy mood when it again met, anxious

[1] McKee, 97. [2] New York *Tribune*, June 19, 1856.

[3] *Ib.*, June 20, 1856.

[4] Philadelphia Correspondence, New York *Tribune*, June 18, in issue of June 19, 1856.

[5] *Ib.* Indiana vigorously urged Henry S. Lane for Vice President.

[6] *Era:* Cole, 149. [7] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 11, 1856.

[8] Archer to Lincoln, June 21, 1856. Weik MSS.

to applaud every candidate put forward and to laugh at every joke. Allison kept his promise to name the favorite of Illinois, and he added on his own account, that 'he knew him [Lincoln] to be the prince of good fellows, and an old line Whig. [Cheers.]'[1]

Thereupon, Archer, in a typical convention nominating speech, told the delegates that he had known Lincoln for more than thirty years. Lincoln had been born in Kentucky and always had been a Clay Whig. Archer had 'no fear of the North of Illinois,' but the people of the southern part of the State had come from Kentucky and Tennessee. 'With Lincoln on the ticket Illinois would be safe for Frémont. [Cheers.]' Archer believed that 'it would be safe without him [loud cheers and laughter], but doubly safe with him.'

'Judge Spaulding of Ohio. Can Mr. Lincoln fight?

'Col. Archer (jumping at least eighteen inches from the floor, and gesturing emphatically with his arms) YES *SIR*. He is a son of Kentucky. [Loud and prolonged laughter and cheers.]'

A young New Jersey delegate declared that he was 'an Old Line Democrat' who had worked for Pierce and, if he had then had a vote, would have voted for him — he was now ashamed of it. But, since an old line Democrat had been nominated for President, an old line Whig must be chosen for Vice President. Dayton was the man '[Cheers]' — with him 'success was certain. [Cheers.]'

Then Palmer took the floor and made a rousing speech for Lincoln. He, too, was an old line Democrat, he said; he, too, had voted for Pierce; and he, too, 'was sorry for it. [Laughter.]' Palmer had met Lincoln, he said — 'no, he meant rather that when Mr. Lincoln was about in political contests, he (Mr. Palmer) generally dodged. [Laughter.]' Lincoln would be a fine candidate, but if Dayton should be selected 'Illinois was there. [Cheers.]' Or if Wilmot were chosen, Illinois would support him. '[Loud cheers.]' Palmer declared that 'he intended to name his next boy David Wilmot. [Prolonged laughter and cheers.] But if they wanted ten thousand additional votes in Illinois give them Abraham Lincoln. [Loud Cheers.]'

So on the first or 'informal ballot' one hundred and ten dele-

[1] New York *Tribune*, June 20, 1856.

gates voted for Lincoln.[1] But the tide for Dayton was too strong, he received two hundred and fifty-nine votes, and, on the formal ballot, was nominated, but not by acclamation — four delegates from Connecticut, fourteen from New York, and two from Pennsylvania voted for Lincoln, while eleven other votes from those States were scattered among several favorites.[2]

On behalf of the Illinois delegation, Palmer thanked those who 'have honored the favorite son of our State with their vote.' Illinois was 'devoted' to the 'great cause that has brought us together. [Cheers.] She knew that in Abraham Lincoln we had a soldier tried and true. We offered him to the Republican party of the United States' for the Vice Presidency; 'but we are content to prefer harmony and union to the success even of our cherished favorite.' So let those who had persisted in voting for Lincoln, now make the nomination of Dayton 'unanimous. [Loud applause.]'[3]

In this fashion and under the favorable conditions described, Lincoln's name was made known to the several hundred delegates from the entire North, to the scores of politicians in attendance from every Northern State, to the throng of spectators who crowded the hall, and to the scores of thousands of readers of the New York and other newspapers that printed detailed accounts of the Convention. Nearly all the delegates, visiting politicians, and hundreds of auditors at the Philadelphia 'People's Convention' in 1856 were to be present, in the same capacities, at the great Republican Convention at Chicago four years later. Archer, Palmer, Judd, and the whole Illinois delegation had impressed upon the minds of all that Lincoln was the best man in Illinois to get votes.

In this way, too, Lincoln was irrevocably committed to the new party no matter how much it was 'platformed.' By the use

[1] Maine one, New Hampshire eight, Massachusetts seven, Rhode Island two, New York three, Pennsylvania eleven, Ohio two, Indiana twenty-six, Illinois thirty-three, Michigan five, California twelve. Philadelphia Correspondence of the New York *Tribune*, June 19, in issue of June 20, 1856.

[2] Convention Correspondence, New York *Tribune*, June 19, in issue of June 20, 1856. All papers in the larger cities of the North gave detailed accounts of the Philadelphia Convention.

[3] *Ib.* A synopsis of the proceedings was published in the *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 18 and 19, 1856.

of that word in his letter to Trumbull he had with characteristic caution opened a line for retreat if he wanted to get out; and we have but to compare the Decatur and Bloomington platforms, together with Lincoln's printed speeches and letters at the time, with the Philadelphia platform, to see that the Kansas plank was too strong to suit him. But he said nothing against it; and after the work his friends had done for him at the national gathering and the heavy vote given him there, he could not have dropped the new party without political ruin, even if he had wanted to do so.

'We are glad Mr. Lincoln got so many votes for Vice President,' exulted the ardent Frémont paper, the *Chicago Democrat*. 'There is no political Maine Lawism or Know-Nothingism about him and a better Frémont man does not live.' [1]

Lincoln was in court at Urbana when the news came that a hundred and ten votes had been cast for him for Vice President. He could not believe it. There was a big man of the name of Lincoln in Massachusetts and he must be the one to whom such support had been given, he told Whitney. But those closest to Lincoln always thereafter firmly believed that from that moment, his ambition was fixed upon securing the Presidential nomination itself next time.[2] What he said and did henceforward must be considered with this fact in mind; for Lincoln's every word and act during the intervening four years fit perfectly into the plan and purpose which his nearest associates were, and continued to be, convinced that he had formed.

Hard as was Lincoln's task of getting his obstinate fellow partisans of by-gone days into the new party, the nomination of Frémont made it harder still. Below the northern part of Illinois, the old line Whigs, who in sullen indecision had stood aloof, now recoiled sharply from the candidacy of the theatrical 'Pathfinder.' He was not their kind of man. 'It would have been easier for us here, I think, had we got McLean,' Lincoln advised Trumbull; 'but as it is, I am not without high hopes for the state . . . we shall elect Bissell, at all events and if we can get rid of the Fillmore ticket, we shall carry the state for Frémont also.' [3]

[1] *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, July 5, 1856. [2] Whitney, 80–1.

[3] Lincoln to Trumbull, June 27, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

The experienced politicians in charge of the campaign for the new party, and the newspapers in whose hands its fortunes so largely vested, adopted the usual tactics of feeding the fires of enthusiasm where it did exist, and of pretending that ardor was flaming in places where there was no warmth. Greeley sent appropriate telegrams everywhere. In response to one of them, Herndon, who was Secretary of the County Central Committee, and by all odds the most active 'Republican' in Springfield,[1] wrote to the New York *Tribune* that the nomination of Frémont and Dayton was 'quite popular' in Springfield — indeed, 'the very best that could have been made.' Illinois was 'safe' — in fact 'the prairie is on fire — the flames go with a leap and a bound, consuming the dry grass as they go.' [2]

What nonsense! said the *State Register* in truthful if partisan comment on Herndon's fanciful report; he knew that the news of Frémont's nomination had been 'received with curses loud and deep' in that part of Illinois; he knew that the *Illinois State Journal*, 'his organ here,' did not come out for the Philadelphia ticket for more than a week after it was named; he knew that so fearful were the Fusionists to use even 'the little humbug's *name*,' that their newspaper in Springfield called the 'recent Frémont county convention, a "Whig meeting."' But politics were politics — Herndon and his 'clique' were playing the game.[3]

Little to be trusted as partisan comment always is, the acrid sarcasm of the Democratic organ stated the facts. Even the cautious Lincoln was too sanguine in his report to Trumbull. Stuart was confirmed in his dislike of the new party. So was Matheny. Except in northern Illinois, so were leading Whigs all over the State. They began to organize. Whig conventions were called. A Whig State ticket was nominated. Matheny became the Whig candidate for Congress in the Springfield Dis-

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 16, 1856. Adherents of the new party in Springfield did not yet, nor for a long time thereafter, call it 'Republican.'

[2] W. H. Herndon to the *Tribune*, July 1, 1856, clipped in *Illinois State Register*, July 12, 1856. 'All the machinery is put to work to create enthusiasm whether it exists or not.' *Rushville Times* (Democrat), Sept. 26, 1856.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 12, 1856. Italics *Register's*.

trict. Gillespie was made a Fillmore Presidential Elector at Large.[1]

Great Fillmore meetings were held. At one in Springfield, Stuart denounced 'black republicanism' with heat — 'the result, if not the design of their movement, was to array the north against the south,' he asserted, while the Democrats 'were governed by southern Hotspurs.' Matheny, too, belabored black republicanism — 'he was a whig and nothing else' — the Whigs should not be 'sold out,' he shouted.[2] Similar meetings were held, similar speeches made by Whigs all over the country. The Democrats encouraged the movement with thanksgiving and joy — perhaps with cash.

In this situation, Lincoln plunged into the campaign. From every quarter the calls for him were insistent and loud. They came from adjacent States, too — from Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa. William Grimes of Iowa urged Lincoln to come to that State. 'I am superstitious,' Lincoln answered in declining — outside speakers usually lost elections. Of course, if the Democrats should call in 'a foreign champion,' Lincoln would 'have no objection to drive a nail in his track.' [3] So, with a few exceptions, Lincoln would not go anywhere except to the Whig strongholds of central and southern Illinois. That region was the field where stubborn Whig votes were thickest and were hardest to glean. Trumbull wrote Herndon that work must be done in that quarter. Very well, replied the junior partner, Lincoln and he would go, 'as you suggest, into the southern part of our State.' [4] Again Herndon reassured Trumbull: 'Lincoln this moment has gone south east, . . . and will go further south. I shall follow soon.' [5] James C. Conkling, Republican State Chairman, tried to get up meetings in counties where Whigs flourished.[6]

Strong was the need of effort to win the recalcitrant old followers of Webster and Clay. They saw no reason for joining the

[1] *Illinois State Register*, Oct. 11, 1856.

[2] *Ib.*, July 23, 1856.

[3] Lincoln to William Grimes, July 12, 1856. *Works*, II, 290–1.

[4] Herndon to Trumbull, July 12, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[5] *Ib.*, Aug. 4, 1856. *Ib.*

[6] *Ib.*, Aug. 11, 1856. *Ib.*

new party; indeed, many of them thought that it was a deadly menace to the Republic. 'Some fool old-line Whigs would go for Buck, if Fillmore did not run,' Herndon advised Trumbull.[1] Even the tidings of blood and fire from Kansas did not move such men from their allegiance to their party, and especially to Fillmore who was a Know-Nothing and a Whig, too. Besides, said they, he could do as much for Kansas and against slavery extension as Frémont could do.

Fearful, indeed, was the news from that Territory. It now had become 'Bleeding Kansas' in fact. The hope of Greeley, Judd, and all Republican politicians that 'the Kansas excitement' would keep up until the fall elections was more than fulfilled, and at terrible cost.

Immediately after the sack of Lawrence and in retaliation of that outrage, the Free-State men who, just before the attack, had left that town with their Sharp's rifles, began reprisals. The other side was swift in deadly answer. Up to that time the death of any man in an election fracas or combat of any kind, even in a personal quarrel over a land claim, had been called a 'murder' by his fellow partisans. But only five or six lives had been lost in this way on both sides, during the whole two years since the settlement of Kansas began; and it is hard if not impossible to find the exact cause of those fatalities or to fix the whole blame for them.

But killings now became real murders in cold blood, and the number of them swiftly grew. Without mercy, often without excuse, both sides shot and stabbed and slew. If there can be any degree of guilt in conduct so atrocious, the blackest of these crimes was committed by John Brown and his sons. Also, it was among the first, if not the very first, of that series of homicides which made that brief space in the annals of Kansas, the most forbidding in American history.[2]

John Brown was captain of a company of volunteers, enrolled for the defence of Lawrence.[3] About midnight, on May 24,

[1] Herndon to Trumbull, July 12, 1856. *Ib.*

[2] The brief sketch of Kansas affairs in the text is from the sources named in note on page 305, Vol. III; also from *Geary and Kansas*, etc.: John H. Gihon, M.D., the most impartial and accurate account written at the time.

[3] The muster roll and service are given in Villard, 121.

1856, he, his sons and three others, went to the cabin of a settler from Tennessee, James P. Doyle, aroused the family and, saying that he and his party were from the Northern Army, took Doyle and two of his sons out on the prairie and killed them. One was shot and stabbed, the head of another was split open and his arms cut from his body, the chest and side of a third was mangled and his fingers chopped off;[1] at the frantic plea of his mother, the youngest Doyle boy was spared. Two other pro-slavery men were taken from cabins near by and slaughtered in the same way.[2] Taking the horses of the dead and of another pro-slavery man, Brown then left. Doyle, at least, while pro-slavery, was a mild, quiet person who had taken no part in the violence of his party.

The Committee of Congress was taking testimony in Kansas at the time. The Democratic member, Oliver of the Missouri border district, demanded that witnesses be examined on the murders Brown had committed. The Republican majority, Sherman of Ohio and Howard of Michigan, refused — nor did they make mention of the atrocity in their report to the House. Most newspapers supporting Frémont and Dayton said little or nothing about the affair. Those that did faintly make note of it, misrepresented it or actually justified it. For the most part, knowledge of the outrage was suppressed by such papers and by all Frémont speakers during the campaign; and so covered up and excused was it, that for two decades after the close of the Civil War many denied that John Brown had any part in it, although he admitted responsibility from the first. But Oliver's minority report to the House and affidavits attached forced the horror upon the attention of Congress, and it was denounced in furious terms.

The countryside where these killings were done shook with alarm and anger. Settlers in the vicinity, 'regardless of party,' met, branded the murderers as 'midnight assassins,' and pledged support to the capture and punishment of them. With incredible speed the news flew over the Territory. Pro-slavery and Law

[1] Affidavits of Mahala Doyle and John Doyle in testimony attached to minority report. *Howard Committee*, 1193–5.

[2] Affidavits of James Harris and Louisa Jane Wilkinson. *Ib.*, 1195–9.

and Order newspapers at Leavenworth and Atchison issued furious extras. The Missouri border flamed with rage. Shannon issued belated and futile proclamations.

The 'militia' was again called out. Punitive expeditions took the field. Free-State bands resisted, retaliated, gave blow for blow, shot for shot; and attacked on their part. Colonel Sumner and his United States dragoons strove without avail to keep order. Both sides denounced him. Henceforth, and during most of the Presidential campaign, Kansas was a place of rapine, robbery, arson, and bloodshed.

From the moral point of view, both sides were guilty, almost equally guilty; but politics dominated all accounts that went to the country at large.[1] In the Frémont press, the Free-State partisans were represented as exclusively brave and noble men fighting for liberty; [2] in the Democratic press, they were branded only as outlaws bent on violence and plunder.[3] Exactly the reverse was said about the pro-slavery and Law and Order men. Anti-Administration and anti-slavery sentiment was in constant volcanic eruption throughout the North. Feeling in the South, though more quiet, was just as hot on the other side, and was based on reports and assumptions as partial and as false.

Nearly all Kansas marauders, whether pro-slavery or Free-State, were very young men, hardly more than boys. They finally came to be moved by love of adventure, by craving for loot, and by sheer blood-lust, as much as by devotion to the respective 'causes' for which they pretended to fight. With hearty good will, each side stole horses from the other side, and did the worst things they could think of. Even the *Herald of Freedom* finally admitted that this was true of some Free-State

[1] Gihon testifies that the guerilla war was begun by the Free-State men: They stole horses and 'attacked the pro-slavery men in the roads and at their dwellings, and committed most flagrant outrages.' Gihon, 86.

[2] 'The Northern men have gone to Kansas as settlers of the soil; the Missouri army under the command of Atchison to drive them out. The only "crime" which Lane and his men have been guilty of is that of DARING TO SETTLE IN KANSAS; it is this, which has provoked the civil war.' *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Sept. 8, 1856.

[3] 'The Beecher riflemen are carrying things with a high hand in Kansas. Lane has organized an insurrection on a large scale.' *Illinois Daily State Register*, Sept. 9, 1856.

'The great bulk of the outrages have been committed by the free state men, as the marauding and predatory bands call themselves.' *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 11, 1856, quoting the article of an 'Eye-Witness' in the *Albany Atlas and Argus*.

partisans.[1] The turbulence and the utter collapse of law drew to the Territory desperate characters from everywhere, as such a state of things always has done.[2] This fact was not admitted — indeed, it was hotly denied — by both political parties throughout the Nation.

On July 4, the Free-State 'legislature' met at Topeka. Nothing could have been done more certain to aggravate the bloody situation. Under orders of the Acting Governor Colonel Sumner dispersed them. Fresh fuel this, and soaked in oil, for Republican oratory and journalism — Federal soldiers driving freemen from the legislative hall! Federal bayonets at the throat of liberty![3]

Soon after the beginning of this guerilla warfare, the pro-slavery authorities and forces at Missouri towns on the river closed it to boats carrying men from the North bound for Kansas. Most were stopped at Lexington, none got beyond Westport. Many passengers were genuine immigrants, many others were bent only on strife. All were heavily armed; even those who really meant to settle in Kansas had rifles and knives. The weapons were taken from them and whole parties sent back. One such company from Chicago was disarmed at Lexington, the weapons stored, a receipt for them given, and the adventurers returned to Alton.[4]

One side said that this barring of the river was a necessary

[1] 'Disguise the fact as much as we will, there is a class of irresponsible persons, calling themselves Free State men, who are engaged in horse stealing, and other crimes against pro-slavery settlers.' *Herald of Freedom*, Nov. 29, 1856.

'Each party annoyed the other by raiding the camps and taking each other's horses. We would get their horses one night, and they would get them back. . . . Then they would take our horses or something of ours. . . . We took each other prisoner,' etc. Morrall, *Kansas Hist. Coll.*, XIV, 130.

[2] Gihon, 89–90. [3] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Sept. 12, 1856.

[4] *St. Louis Republican*, clipped in the *Liberator*, July 4, 1856.

'No hard words passed.' The Chicago men had been given $100 each to go to Kansas.

Republican papers were enraged by this incident and printed savage editorials. New York *Tribune*, July 3; *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 7; *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, July 12; *Canton Weekly Register*, July 17; *Rockford Republican*, July 24, 1856.

The Democratic press denounced the Chicago company as 'that band of hirelings and would-be bullies.' *Cairo Weekly Times and Delta*, July 9, 1856. 'They looked and acted more like a set of desperadoes.' *Ottawa Free Trader*, July 5, 1856.

The *State Journal* and all Republican papers branded such charges as lies and stood up for the accused companies as 'emigrants abused by the Missouri and South Carolina slavery clans.' *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 1 and 7, 1856.

measure of defence; the other side angrily declared that it was a pro-slavery act of war. It availed little, in any case — emigrants and fighting men went to Kansas through Iowa and Nebraska.[1] On both sides, the marauding bands and those intent on vengeance, grew in numbers and were called 'armies.' Those of the Free State Party finally became the larger and were far better equipped.

Fights between the warring forces amounted to skirmishes and were referred to as 'battles.' Several were fought. One at Osawatomie became famous — three hundred pro-slavery men under 'General' Reid attacked Brown and thirty or forty Free-State partisans and, after a fight of three hours, defeated them. The 'victors' burned the town, robbed the mail, stole cattle and horses, and murdered a man.[2]

Black headlines in Frémont papers throughout the North announced the catastrophe — twenty Free-State soldiers were dead, ran the sensational report, among them Brown and his son.[3] Greeley was always foremost in giving the most startling news. '*For the blood which has been shed in Kansas, for the civil war which exists in Kansas, for the consequences of making Kansas a slave State, should that event happen, and for all that is bitter and ferocious in the modern school of politics, it* [the *Tribune*] *is more responsible than any newspaper in the Union,*' — so charged the *New York Express*, a Whig and Know-Nothing journal.[4]

So it came about that 'Bleeding Kansas' was the chief source of political agitation in every free State during the Frémont campaign — the chief topic of editorials and articles, of campaign speeches, of general talk. The *New York Herald* said that the real issue and the only issue was 'Shall Kansas be a Free State or a Slave State?'[5] The Kansas 'war' together with the

[1] Gihon, 93. 'Large and well-armed companies came pouring in, many of them of irreproachable character, who came to the relief of the oppressed; and others of desperate fortunes, eager to take part in the disturbances from a spirit of revenge or a love of excitement; and still others, perhaps, for the sole purpose of plunder.'

[2] Gihon, 100.

[3] New York *Tribune*, Sept. 6, 1856. For typically partisan account of 'the battle of Osawatomie' see *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, Sept. 8, 1856. The Frémont press generally glorified Brown as a hero and saint.

[4] As quoted in *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 23, 1856. Italics *Register's*.

[5] Clipped in *Illinois State Journal*, Sept. 3, 1856.

assault on Sumner drove thousands to Frémont who otherwise would have gone to Buchanan.[1]

In Illinois, the *State Journal* fiercely asserted that 'half the truth is not told' about the outrages in Kansas, laid the blame on the Administration and declared that Buchanan would continue its policy of blood.[2] Signers of a 'monster petition' asked Governor Matteson to call an extra session of the Legislature to 'devise some means to protect the citizens of Illinois' in Kansas from the Border Ruffians.[3] Matteson, of course, ignored the request; but he notified several companies of militia 'to hold themselves in readiness to proceed to Kansas.'[4] Military companies were organized and equipped to go to the Territory to fight.[5]

The principal Republican campaign documents were Sumner's 'Crime Against Kansas,' Seward's speech for 'Free Kansas,' an analysis of 'The Laws of Kansas' by Schuyler Colfax of Indiana, the Majority Report of the Kansas Congressional Committee,[6] and the House Committee's Report on Brooks.

[1] John P. Mann, Chairman anti-Nebraska (Republican) Committee, Chester, Ill., to Trumbull, June 17, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Sept. 12, 1856.

[3] *Aurora Daily Beacon*, Sept. 24, 1856; *Rockford Register*, Sept. 13, 1856; *Urbana Union*, Sept. 18, 1856.

'We have sent the petition to the Governor, now let us go to work and send men and means to Kansas to conquer it effectually for Freedom.' *Aurora Daily Beacon*, Sept. 24, 1856.

[4] *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, Oct. 4, 1856.

[5] 'Twenty-seven men under the command of Rev. Wm. Strawn, intend to take up their line of march for Kansas. They go armed with Sharp's rifles, we believe, and doubtless will strike terror into the border ruffians.' *Ottawa Free Trader*, June 14, 1856. Strawn's company was disarmed and sent back. *Ib.*, July 5 and 12, 1856.

'The company for Kansas is now organized. . . . It is composed of men of the right stamp.' *Rockford Republican*, June 25, 1856.

'One hundred men leave Chicago for Kansas next Monday, via the Rock Island railroad. Gen. Lane meets them at Iowa City on Tuesday.' *Aurora Guardian*, June 12, 1856.

'Who then is possessed of heroism and enterprise sufficient to volunteer to raise a company to go to Kansas.' *Rockford Republican*, March 5, 1856, and others in Illinois and throughout the North.

[6] New York *Tribune*, July 29, 1856. Also Trumbull MSS. from July to Nov., 1856. Most requests to Trumbull from Illinois constituents were for some of these documents, chiefly Sumner's speech and the report of the Kansas Committee. All were printed by the New York *Tribune*, for campaign uses.

The principal Democratic campaign documents were Douglas's Kansas report of March 12, 1856, and his Kansas speeches of March 20 and April 4, 1856. These speeches

'The demand for Sumner's speech is beyond calculation or precedent,' reported the New York *Tribune*.[1] 'Scatter the Kansas investigating Committee's report,' Herndon urged Trumbull.[2] Typical of Republican campaign literature was a pamphlet entitled 'THE REIGN OF TERROR IN KANSAS, *as Encouraged by President Pierce, and Carried out by the Southern Slave Power*.' Wholesale robbery, burning, rape, murder, and like atrocities by Border Ruffians, were described; and the text was embellished with crude pictures of flogging, scalping, and bowie-knifing.

Lincoln's letters, however, and newspaper reports of what he said, show that he took no part in the Kansas agitation; most certainly he did not fan the flames of fury that swept over the North. His moderation, his hatred of violence in any form or by anybody, his passion for fairness, perhaps the information Delahay had given him, kept him cool among those who bore firebrands. Also Delahay was now in Illinois. At a meeting in Springfield toward the end of September, Lincoln spoke to a crowd that 'jammed' the Hall of Representatives, but he gave most of his time to the attitude of the Government toward slavery, 'from its earliest history' until Douglas interfered, and said nothing about Kansas outrages and nothing to offend his former fellow partisans.[3]

For Lincoln's work was cut out for him — he must persuade the old line Whigs to leave Fillmore and go for Frémont. These Whigs were genuine conservatives. Above all things, they were for regular government, for law and order, and 'the Kansas excitement' did not appeal to them as it stirred radicals and those of emotional temperament.

July 10 a great 'Free Kansas' Convention was held at Buffalo. Reeder presided. Gerrit Smith demanded war, and pledged himself to give fifteen hundred dollars a month to buy

were printed in German and circulated in Illinois. This alarmed Republican politicians, and they clamored for Republican speeches also in German. C. Cook and L. Raugh to Trumbull, Ottawa, Ill., July 29, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

Three hundred thousand of Douglas's Kansas Report were printed: he paid one-third of the cost and gave money to his party's campaign fund. *Douglas:* Johnson, 304–5.

[1] June 3, 1856. [2] Herndon to Trumbull, July 12, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Sept. 26, 1856. 'Never was he so powerful.'

Sharp's rifles for the 'freemen of Kansas' until they won their fight. Eli Thayer was made General Manager of a vast and intricate organization covering the whole North to collect provisions, money, and arms. Not less than one hundred thousand dollars were to be raised every month. 'Organize a Republican or Free-Kansas club in your township, ward, election or school district,' Greeley urged his scores of thousands of readers.[1] A national Kansas relief committee was appointed, of one man from each State. It had little or nothing to do, since the practical work was put in other hands. Lincoln was chosen as the Illinois member.[2] He declined on the ground that he was too busy, and suggested that Fell be appointed in his stead.

In his speeches throughout the campaign Lincoln stuck to two great issues — slavery must not be extended, the Union must be preserved. Not again did he show passion, as at the Bloomington Convention had been necessary. All accounts written at the time, whether by friend or foe, state that he always spoke argumentatively and in a conversational tone, albeit with intense earnestness.

Lincoln went first to German communities, but he found them so strong for Frémont that he did not make many speeches to them. 'God bless the Dutch,' he exclaimed at Belleville, 'almost with tears in his eyes,' when telling the crowd that 'here, as well as in other places where he had spoken, he had found the Germans more enthusiastic for the cause of Freedom than all other nationalities.' [3]

Thus, very early in the campaign, Lincoln became assured that the Germans were 'safe' for the new party. Indeed, from the moment the Philadelphia nominations were made, the Germans had almost taken the lead throughout the North, even over the Republican radicals, in their eager endorsement of 'Frémont and freedom.' [4] So Lincoln gave nearly all of his time and strength to the obstinate old Whigs.

[1] New York *Tribune*, June 13, 1856.

[2] For full proceedings of the Buffalo Convention see New York *Times*, July 11, 1856. Also Thayer, 214–7.

[3] Koerner, II, 32–3.

[4] The New York *Times*, Feb. 26, 1856, published a list of German papers. Even then most of them were 'Republican' and for Frémont. See also *Illinois Daily State Journal*,

'I have just returned from speaking in . . . Edgar, . . . Coles and Shelby counties,' he wrote to Trumbull. 'Our whole trouble along there has been and is Fillmoreism. . . . I think we shall ultimately get all the Fillmore men, who are really anti-slavery extension — the rest will probably go to Buchanan. . . . The great difficulty with anti-slavery extension Fillmore men, is that they suppose Fillmore as good as Frémont on that question.' Trumbull must go to the strong Whig communities at once, insisted Lincoln.[1]

As summer advanced, the regular Whigs became more active, more determined. In the fall, a great Whig meeting was held in Springfield. The *State Journal* [2] belittled it and this only made the Whigs angry. At Albany, New York, early in July, Fillmore, in his capacity of Presidential candidate, stated the issue which Douglas during the previous year had advanced as the capital question of the times — the purely sectional nature of the new party and the certainty that the success of it would force disunion and civil war.

'We see,' said Fillmore, 'a political party presenting candidates . . . selected for the first time from the Free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages of one part of the Union only, to rule over the whole United States. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate? Would he be required to follow the same rule prescribed by those who elected him in making his appointments' — Cabinet members, foreign representatives, heads of departments, Federal Judges?

'Suppose that the South,' argued Fillmore, 'having a majority of the electoral votes, should declare that they would only have slaveholders for President and Vice-President, and

July 12, 16, Aug. 14, 27, Sept. 4, 26, Oct. 2, 1856; *Rockford Republican*, Sept. 3, 1856; *Quincy Whig*, Oct. 4, 1856.

[1] Lincoln to Trumbull, Aug. 11, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[2] Oct. 3, 1856. 'Well may Democrats pat this new Fillmore movement on the back.'

should elect such by their exclusive suffrages to rule over us at the North. Do you think we would submit to it? No, not for a moment. . . . It seems to me impossible that those engaged in this can have contemplated the awful consequences of success. If it breaks asunder the bonds of our Union, and spreads anarchy and civil war through the land, what is it less than moral treason?' [1]

Leading Whigs everywhere felt as keenly as Fillmore that the new party was a peril to the Nation, and that Republican victory would rend the Republic. To avert that catastrophe, many of them decided, early in the campaign, to vote for Buchanan. From Boston, Rufus Choate, greatest and last of the Webster Whigs, struck with all his might. 'The first duty, then, of whigs, not merely as patriots and as citizens, . . . but as whigs, and because we are whigs, is . . . to defeat and dissolve the new geographical party, calling itself republican,' he wrote to the Maine Whig State Central Committee. Indeed that was the 'only duty' of Whigs, he said.

'By what vote can I do most to prevent the madness of the times from working its maddest act, — the very ecstasy of its madness, — the permanent formation and the actual present triumph of a party which knows one half America only to hate and dread it; from whose unconsecrated and revolutionary banner fifteen stars are erased or have fallen; in whose national anthem the old and endeared airs of the Eutaw Springs, and the King's Mountain, and Yorktown, and those, later, of New Orleans, and Buena Vista, and Chapultepec, breathe no more.'

Choate's letter was long, well reasoned, passionate. The peril of the Republican Party to the Union was plain, he insisted. 'Its mere struggle to obtain the government, as that struggle is conducted, is mischievous to an extent incalculable.' If it were the purpose of a political party to work up hostile sentiment to prepare the Nation for war with a foreign power, 'it could not do its business more thoroughly,' than the Republicans were

[1] 'Life and Times of Millard Fillmore:' in *The Republic, or a History of the United States:* John Robert Irelan, XIII, 423–4.

For this speech Fillmore was assailed with utmost virulence by Frémont papers. *New York Herald*, Sept. 24, 1856.

doing in working up Northern feeling against the South. Was that the statesmanship, the patriotism of Washington, Hamilton, Madison, Jackson, Webster, Clay? asked Choate. Was that the counsel of America's mighty dead?

In his terror of the outcome, Choate became frantic, albeit he argued with the lawyer's skill. If the dread work of the Republican Party 'accomplishes its object and gives the Government to the North, I turn my eyes from the consequences. To the fifteen States of the South, that government will appear an alien government. . . . It will appear a hostile government,' — a single, vast section — 'flushed by triumph, cheered onward by the voices of pulpit, tribune, and press. . . . And then and thus is the beginning of the end.'

Kansas was a mere pretext, Choate asserted. 'Strike down the rifle and the bowie knife,' let migration take its natural course, and Kansas would 'choose freedom for itself.' In no other Territory was slavery possible: 'a national party to give them freedom is about as needful and about as feasible as a national party to keep Maine for freedom.' So Whigs must 'do what we can to defeat and disband the geographical party. . . . In these circumstances I vote for MR. BUCHANAN. He has large experience in public affairs; his commanding capacity is universally acknowledged; his life is without a stain;' above all other public men, 'he seems at this moment . . . to represent that sentiment of nationality — tolerant, warm and comprehensive, — without which, without increase of which, America is no longer America.' [1]

Choate's attack on the Republican Party had prodigious effect. All Whig and Democratic papers, and even many that were supporting Frémont, published it.[2] It was printed as a leaflet and distributed by the hundred thousand. Webster's son, Fletcher Webster, took the field and with utmost virulence also assailed the 'sectional or black republican Party' and, like his leader, announced himself for the Democratic candidate.[3]

[1] Choate to the Maine Whig State Central Committee, Aug. 9, in *Boston Courier*, Aug. 14, clipped in New York *Times*, Aug. 15, 1856.

[2] The *Illinois Daily State Register*, Aug. 21, printed Choate's letter in full.

[3] *Ib.*, Sept. 16, 1856.

James B. Clay, the son of Henry Clay, mounted the stump for Buchanan because Republican success would mean 'the dissolution of the Union.'[1] For the same reason Frémont's brother-in-law came out for Buchanan.[2] The new party was, cried State Senator Wadsworth of New York, himself an opponent of slavery extension, a party of '*passion, prejudice, and disunion;*' it was purely sectional and fanatical, '*cannot be a national party,*' and must be destroyed.[3]

Toward the end of the campaign Choate made an elaborate speech at Lowell, Massachusetts, on the line of his letter to the Maine Whigs.[4] On the same grounds, Amos A. Lawrence of Boston, while declining to be a Presidential elector on the 'American' ticket, announced that he would support Fillmore.[5] That Republican success meant disunion and war became the chief issue of all who opposed the new party. Nonsense! answered the *Illinois State Journal.* 'Capitalists and commercial men are asked to "save the members from ruin" and their property from "depreciation," by opposing Frémont and thus "saving the Union."' How absurd! How base![6]

Wendell Phillips increased Whig terror. '*There is merit in the Republican Party,*' he said. 'It is this. It is the *first SECTIONAL party* ever organized in this country. It does not know its own face, and calls itself national, but it is not *national;* it is the *North against the South.*'[7] Greeley frankly admitted the charge, adopted it, pressed it: 'IS THERE A NORTH?' asked the *Tribune.* 'It is high time this question were definitively answered.'[8]

The ablest Southern speakers came North and pleaded, almost with tears, for that national unity and brotherhood which had made the Republic prosperous, happy, and great and

[1] Clay's speech at Tippecanoe Battle Ground, *Illinois Daily State Register,* Sept. 19, 1856.

[2] *Ib.,* Oct. 3, 1856.

[3] As quoted in editorials New York *Times,* July 11, 1856.

[4] In full in *Ib.,* Oct. 30, 1856. 'Before the next President takes his seat, Kansas will be as quiet as Middlesex County.'

[5] Lawrence to Peter L. Cox, July 4, in New York *Times,* July 14, 1856.

[6] *Illinois Daily State Journal,* Oct. 16, 1856.

[7] *Illinois Daily State Register,* Aug. 23, 1856. Italics and capitals *Register's.*

[8] New York *Tribune,* Oct. 31, 1856. Editorial. Capitals Greeley's.

which, they claimed, would be broken by sectional strife.[1] In his campaign speeches in the free States, Breckinridge, the Democratic candidate for Vice President, said that the South could not and would not submit to sectional rule; and he asked his Northern hearers whether they would do so in like case. Sadly many shook their heads in response, while others boldly shouted, No!

In the South, the 'fire-eaters,' now swiftly rising to influence, thundered defiance, and preached secession in fierce and implacable terms. 'The Southern man who would submit to Frémont's election is a traitor and a coward,' shouted Keitt, to a madly cheering crowd of Virginia farmers.[2] '*I have been a disunionist from the time I could think*,' exclaimed Brooks at a banquet in his honor; if Frémont — 'that Frenchman' — were elected, the South must secede, take Washington, seize the Treasury. Brooks, himself, would lead troops for that purpose. Down with the Constitution![3] 'TREASON!' shouted the *State Journal* in an emphatic introductory to an extract from 'Bully Brooks's' speech which that paper printed.[4] On the other hand,

[1] Notably Senator Hunter of Virginia at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., Oct. 1, 1856. Hunter said that it was the first time in his life that he ever made a speech to a popular assembly outside his own State. From the Southern and pro-slavery point of view, his speech was able, and his plea for harmony eloquent. The North was already far stronger than the South, he said, and must grow stronger every day — so why should she insult and irritate the South? The Republican Party was wholly sectional and bent on forcing disunion, etc. New York *Times*, Oct. 2, 1856, published Hunter's speech in full.

Toombs delivered a lecture on slavery in many Northern cities during the first part of the year. He began at Boston. *New York Herald*, Feb. 2, 1856.

Mason of Virginia delivered the oration on Bunker Hill Day at Boston; it was on the advantages of the Union and the necessity of upholding the Constitution. *Alexandria* (Va.) *Gazette*, June 20, 1856.

[2] *New York Herald*, Sept. 11, 1856. 'Where is the Southern man who says the South can stay with the North in this Union, stigmatized, dishonored, reviled, plundered, degraded? [Enthusiastic cheers.]

'Where is the Southern man with the blood of a freeman in his veins, who would not strike down the foul dominators? [Tremendous cheers, which continued for several minutes.]

'I tell you now that if Frémont is elected, adherence to the Union is treason to liberty. [Loud cheers.]

'I tell you now that a Southern man who would submit to his election is a traitor and a coward. [Great Cheers.]'

[3] *Ib.*, Oct. 9, 1856.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Oct. 14, 1856. Capitals *Journal's*. An editorial, clipped from the *New York Herald* in the *Daily Illinois State Journal*, Oct. 17, said that 'the lawless despotism of the South,' as bad as Russia, 'as blood-thirsty as Robespierre,'

think what would happen if Buchanan was elected — the slave trade would be 'reopened.' [1]

The election of Frémont would sound the knell of the Union, said the *Charleston Mercury*.[2] The *Richmond Enquirer* declared that if the sectional party won, the South would withdraw, take with her southern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, set up her own Government, and make treaties with friendly foreign powers.[3] Yet, as a section, the South was quiet — conservative Union sentiment still lingered.[4] It is impossible to repeat this fact too often or with too much emphasis, if we are to get a just and accurate view of Southern feeling at that time. 'All they [Southern people] ask from us is simply to let them alone,' said Buchanan as election day approached.[5]

Such was the condition Lincoln faced. In Central and Southern Illinois great numbers of Whigs and Know-Nothings thought and felt as hundreds of thousands of their party brothers did in other parts of the country. On August 14, a straight-out Whig paper, the *Conservative*, was started in Springfield. It advocated the election of Fillmore. Whig meetings grew in size and spectacular display. The Democrats cheered them on. But neither they nor the great Democratic demonstrations

etc., was 'laboring to subdue the North under threats of disunion . . . and civil war.'

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Nov. 3, 1856. This became a general Republican assertion at the end of the campaign. New York *Tribune*, Nov. 4, 1856, and other Frémont papers during the week before election.

[2] As quoted in New York *Times*, Oct. 11, 1856.

[3] As quoted by Botts in his Petersburg speech, Sept. 28, 1856, in *New York Herald*, Oct. 6, 1856. See *infra*.

The Southern press, led by the *Charleston Mercury*, was almost a unit for secession in the event of Frémont's election. *Ib.*, Sept. 26, 1856.

[4] This was shown in the heavy vote for Fillmore, in Southern States. Now and then this feeling was expressed during the campaign. For instance, Professor Hedrick of the University of North Carolina wrote a strong Union and anti-slavery letter to the *Raleigh Standard* and boldly declared that he was for Frémont; for which he was forced to leave the University. Clipped in New York *Times*, Oct. 14, 1856.

John Minor Botts of Richmond made a strong and determined Union speech at Petersburg, Va., Sept. 28, 1856. *New York Herald*, Oct. 6, 1856.

On Oct. 7, at the celebration in South Carolina of the anniversary of the battle of King's Mountain, 15,000 people from all over the South vociferously cheered the orator of the day, George Bancroft of Massachusetts, the historian and diplomat, and Polk's Secretary of the Navy, when he exclaimed: 'Let the Union stand like your own mountains,' for we are all 'one people.' *New York Herald*, Oct. 11, 1856.

[5] *Buchanan:* Curtis, II, 176.

equalled the Republican gatherings. A tidal wave of emotion swept over the North. In numbers, noise, show, and all the elements of popular uprising, the fight for Frémont was almost identical with that for Harrison in 1840. But the Republicans of 1856 had a definite program, a mass of arguments, a great cause.

The foremost Republican orators in the Nation came to Illinois — Seward, Hale, Wade, Giddings, Wilson, Banks, the newly elected Speaker of the House, Francis P. Blair, Anson Burlingame. Burlingame's tour was an unceasing ovation; at every station thousands thronged to hear and see the hero who had defied and mastered 'Bully Brooks.' [1] All these speakers had been Whigs, Free-Soilers, Know-Nothings, or anti-Nebraska Democrats; and all spoke the Republican language of that super-heated campaign — spoke of 'Bleeding Kansas,' the stricken Sumner, the aggressive, militant, disunionist 'Slave Power.' Those were the subjects that stirred the people. Hundreds of local speakers made every schoolhouse, every grove, resonant with loud pleas. During the campaign, every Kansan who could speak in public was on the stump in Illinois. Among them was Delahay.[2]

'Bleeding Kansas and the infernal outrage of Brooks' would carry Illinois, the Chief of the Land Department of the Illinois Central Railroad assured Trumbull; do not heed the 'howls of blackguards and ruffians, — demagogues and traitors,' he counselled the Senator. 'I am for the war, and to the end.' [3]

Republican speakers also made answer to the Whig and Democratic charge that the Republican Party was sectional and a deadly menace to the Union. Lincoln did the same thing — indeed this was the heart of the speech he made throughout those excited and ominous months; but while his argument on sectionalism and Union was in matter identical with those

[1] New York *Tribune*, Aug. 15, 1856. 'His speeches [referring to those delivered in Ohio] have been a succession of splendid triumphs,' etc.

[2] 'One Mark W. Delahay, sometime general loafer from Kansas, shrieks for freedom' at a Republican meeting at Carlinville. *Illinois Daily State Register*, Oct. 18, 1856. Six of the best speakers from Kansas were at a single Illinois meeting. *Herald of Freedom*, Feb. 16, 1856.

[3] D. C. Phillips to Trumbull, June 17, 1856. Phillips said that Bissell and Hoffman would be elected because they would get the German vote. Trumbull MSS.

made by Republican speakers and newspapers everywhere, Lincoln stated his argument in simpler fashion and plainer words than was done by any other man. The only parts of his speech that he wrote out for the press were on those subjects.

At Galena, he spoke as if his opponents were facing him in the crowd — an effective trick of oratory which Lincoln favored and used with force and skill. 'You further charge us with being disunionists. . . . It is untrue. . . . Do you find it in our platform, our speeches, our conventions, or anywhere? If not, withdraw the charge.'

What folly, exclaimed Lincoln, was Fillmore's charge that the election of President and Vice President from the same section would necessarily dissolve the Union. The Constitution said nothing about the latitude and longitude of States from which those officials came — it only required that they should come from different States. Did the election of Jackson and Calhoun, both from slave States, dissolve the Union? asked Lincoln. When those places were filled by Tyler of Virginia and King of Alabama, was the Union thereby endangered? At the present moment both offices were occupied by Northern men,[1] 'and the Union stands and will stand. You do not pretend that it ought to dissolve the Union, and the facts show that it won't' — so there was nothing in the disunion charge.

The only thing that might dissolve the Union, said Lincoln, was the restoration of the Missouri Compromise; but it was not likely that that measure would be reënacted, because it would require 'a decided majority' to do it. Even if the Republicans had the power to restore the Compromise, they 'would have no desire to dissolve the Union.'

If it was said that it would be unconstitutional to enact the old restrictions of slavery and that some States would not submit, the answer was that the Supreme Court of the United States alone could decide the question of constitutionality;

[1] Pierce of New Hampshire and Jesse D. Bright of Indiana. William R. King of Alabama, who was elected Vice President with Pierce, had died, and Bright, who was President of the Senate in 1856, was in effect Vice President of the United States.

'and we will submit to its decisions; and if you do also, there will be an end of the matter.' Thus Lincoln in 1856 took the exact ground on which Douglas stood the following year and thereafter. The Democratic press promptly endorsed Lincoln's statement as 'sound,' but said that the Republican Party denied that very doctrine — would Lincoln stand by it in the future? [1]

Would the Democrats accept as final what the Supreme Court might say? asked Lincoln. 'If not, who are the disunionists — you or we?'

But, no matter what happened, exclaimed Lincoln, 'the Union will not be dissolved. We don't want to dissolve it, and if you attempt it we won't let you,' Lincoln again warned the South.

'With the purse and sword, the army, navy, and treasury, in our hands and at our command, you could not do it. This government would be very weak indeed if a majority with a disciplined army and navy and a well-filled treasury, could not preserve itself when attacked by an unarmed, undisciplined, unorganized minority.

'All this talk about the dissolution of the Union is humbug, nothing but folly. We do not want to dissolve the Union; you shall not.' [2] Thus in 1856 Lincoln stated that purpose which he was to carry out as President, the purpose to put down secession by force — if the South should go out of the Union, the North would bring it back at the point of the bayonet.

Douglas, and all Democratic, Whig, and 'American' speakers, as well as newspapers, made short work of the Republican argument that because three Presidents and Vice Presidents had come from the same section without causing disunion then, the same thing would not cause disunion now. Lincoln assumed that 'the political aspect of the country is the same now as it was then,' said the *Conservative*. 'If they are similar, in the name of history, tell us in what?' He said that slavery is the great issue — was 'THAT . . . the all-absorbing question in 1828, in 1840 and 1841? . . . It was not even thought of.' The danger now was the election of a President and Vice President 'as the

[1] *Rock Island Argus*, clipped in *Illinois Daily State Register*, Aug. 11, 1856.

[2] *Works*, II, 292–5.

avowed representatives of a purely sectional principle,' the Whig organ pointed out.

That paper mourned Lincoln's fall. 'We ask all honest men, if this isn't shameful.' He was no longer the Lincoln of old, lamented the Whig paper. 'We have known him too long and too well as a leader in the glorious Whig army. Though gone from us now — lost to us and lost forever, yet there are many glorious recollections of the past around which our memories fondly linger. Many times and oft have our souls been kindled by the burning eloquence that gushed spontaneously from his heart. Time and again have his thrilling words sent new life through every Whig bosom.' There could be but one explanation for the change in Lincoln, the *Conservative* continued; he was now 'drawing his political sustenance from the breast of that diseased old hag abolitionism,' and was 'tainted with the corruptions of his political mother.' [1]

Trouble arose in the new party; the talk was that Bissell wanted Lincoln to take his place as candidate for Governor, Bissell to run for Senator against Douglas in 1858. 'Long' John Wentworth was at the bottom of it, said the Democrats; he wanted to split the friends of Lincoln and Bissell and thus get the Senatorial candidacy for himself. Lincoln flatly said no: it was 'well understood by the party that he is to be the next senator, from the fact that he was defrauded out of it by the last legislature. . . . He has no idea of making room for another renegade democrat, and if the old-line whigs are to be sold out again,' Lincoln 'is done spending his time and money canvassing the state.' [2] So the deal fell through. Although the account of it is partisan, and, of course, inaccurate, something of the kind did take place. Thus were personal ambition and small intrigue present, even in a great national fight over a great national issue.

As the campaign wore on, the charge of Republican sectionalism made pronounced headway. A movement began among the Whigs to follow the advice of Choate and other old time Whig leaders, to support Buchanan in order to avert disunion. To check this tendency, and to save Whig votes for Fillmore, a

[1] *Conservative*, Aug. 21, 1856. [2] *Illinois Daily State Register*, Sept. 5, 1856.

National Whig Convention was held at Baltimore in mid-September. Delegates came from twenty-six States.[1]

It was a solemn assemblage of earnest men, moved wholly by fear for the Union. The chairman was Edward Bates of Missouri, who was to be Lincoln's first Attorney General. The Convention promptly and unanimously ratified the Know-Nothing, or 'American' ticket, Fillmore and Donelson, and adopted a platform that stated in grave terms the issue of the hour: a party, 'founded only on geographical distinctions,' would surely destroy the Union because the Nation was made up of 'widespread' sections with different climates, different products, and different 'social and domestic institutions.'

It was an 'absolute necessity' to avoid geographical parties — that was a 'fundamental article' of Whig faith. Washington saw clearly the danger of such parties; his warning against them was being 'fearfully' justified by the sectional strife now going on; and that terrible and foolish strife must be stopped at once, or the Union was lost.

All lovers of the Constitution must 'look with alarm' on the two major political parties now in the field — 'one claiming only to represent sixteen northern States, and the other appealing mainly to the passions and the prejudices of the Southern States.' The success of either would ruin the country. The only way to prevent that catastrophe was to elect as President a man who held each section in equal regard, and was pledged to neither.

Such a man was Fillmore, asserted the Whigs. Regardless of the 'peculiar doctrines' of the party which had already nominated him, Fillmore was an ideal candidate in the present crisis — wise, moderate, experienced, firm, with 'calm, pacific temperament,' but a vigorous executive who was whole-heartedly devoted to the Constitution and, far above all other merits, not connected with either of the sectional parties 'now struggling for political supremacy.' [2]

In short, the National Whigs, formally and as a party, made

[1] Only California, Iowa, Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin were not represented. McKee, 94.

[2] McKee, 94–6.

the preservation of the Union, imperilled by sectional parties, their one great issue — their only issue. And it was an issue that appealed to masses of conservative Union men in the South as well as in the North — to more in the South, indeed, than in the North as the election showed.

But the Republicans gained strength every day. The Kansas relief organization permeated every Northern State, every county, well-nigh every township. Great numbers of women were among its agents.[1] The majority of Protestant ministers, except those of the Episcopal Church, preached for it, talked for it, worked for it.[2] For the first time in a national political campaign, preachers, as such, and women, as such, took active part. 'Among the strongest aids of the Black Republican party . . . may be numbered the Pulpit and Petticoats,' snarled the *Indianapolis State Sentinel* after the election.[3] All these efforts aided the Republican cause. In practical results on votes the Kansas organization and that of the new party were one.

During August matters in Kansas became so bad that the President removed Shannon and sent a strong, just, and able man to put down violence, restore order, establish peace. His name was John White Geary of Pennsylvania. He was well fitted for his hard task,[4] and well he did it.

Before he reached his post he saw Governor Sterling Price of Missouri, and through the efforts of the two men the blockade of the Missouri River was lifted and that waterway again opened to all immigrants.[5] In Kansas itself the new Governor found a saturnalia of lawlessness and ruffianism — acting Governor Woodson had proclaimed the Territory to be in a state of

[1] *Aurora Guardian*, Aug. 7, Oct. 9, Oct. 23; *Aurora Daily Beacon*, Sept. 17; *Rockford Republican*, Oct. 16, Oct. 23, 1856.

[2] This had been going on since 1854. *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Sept. 17, 1854.

[3] Nov. 13, 1856.

[4] Geary was a civil engineer and had studied law. He commanded a Pennsylvania regiment in the Mexican War and was wounded in battle; and, because of cool-headed gallantry, was made military governor of Mexico City when that place was occupied by the American forces. He was given practical control of San Francisco from the acquisition of California until a State Constitution was formed, when he was elected the first Mayor of the City. Geary was thirty-seven years old when he became Governor of Kansas.

[5] Gihon, 103.

rebellion. Under Geary's orders, United States troops put an end to guerilla warfare, suppressed marauders, protected peaceable citizens. In doing so he was as impartial as he was stern — both sides were treated alike. As the Presidential election drew near peace had been restored and normal conditions were well under way.[1]

But Geary's work in Kansas did not soften the language of Republican press and spokesmen in the political campaign. Rather the progressive establishment of law and order by Federal soldiers inflamed Republican denunciation and appeal. Here, said stump speakers and newspapers, was fresh evidence that the 'Slave Power,' through its tool, Franklin Pierce, was using the Army of the United States to crush freedom in Kansas. Because he did not take their side pro-slavery men in Missouri and Kansas were even more bitter toward Geary. The South, as a section, was comparatively silent — almost it may be said to have been resigned to the now plainly inevitable outcome. Thus the campaign raged on.

From the beginning of the Presidential contest Republican meetings had been clamorous and large, and as the weeks and months went by those gatherings became greater and more earnest. Indeed, they finally exceeded in numbers and enthusiasm those of the Log Cabin and Hard Cider campaign of 1840, which they so much resembled.

Along the dusty roads stretching through the vast prairies, slowly rolled big wagons filled with whole families on their way to hear noted speakers.[2] Rural fife and drum corps shrilled and rattled. Cavalcades of young men and women wearing gay sashes and liberty caps rode proudly in long parades. At night meetings in towns a new feature attracted lively interest — in the processions companies of youths, wearing uniforms, carried torches. They cheered vociferously on the slightest pretext or without any pretext at all, and were as ready to fight as to

[1] *Gihon*, 204, 214. 'No sooner had the war ceased, in September last, on the arrival of Gov. Geary, than our people engaged at once in their usual avocations.' *Herald of Freedom*, Dec. 20, 1856.

[2] The custom of farmers going long distances with their families and 'hired men' to attend party 'rallies' continued throughout the seventies. Often these meetings would last two or three days.

cheer. They were called the 'Wide Awakes.'[1] Presently we shall see them marching to war at Lincoln's call.

Songs by glee clubs, the assemblages often joining in the chorus, were a big feature of the campaign — and a big factor. In most of these songs, with Kansas as the motif, the militant note was sharply struck. Examples are:

'March! we have sworn to support her,
The prayers of the righteous shall speed us,
A chief never conquered shall lead us —
Frémont shall lead the Free!

'Then from the fields red with slaughter,
Slavery's hordes shall be driven,
Freedom to Kansas be given,
Frémont shall make her Free! Hurrah!'[2]

The chorus of a warlike Frémont song was sung by vast audiences at tremendous Republican meetings in the larger cities of the North, to the tune of the Marseillaise. When thousands of voices thus united in the singing of the inspiring words and air the enthusiasm often became indescribable:

'Arise, arise, ye brave!
And let your war cry be!
Free Speech, Free Press, Free Soil, Free Men,
FRE-MONT AND VICTORY.'[3]

---

[1] For origin and significance of the 'Wide Awakes,' see Vol. III, 224.

[2] 'I have never seen such a belligerent spirit manifested.' A. S. Palmer, Geneva, Wis., to Trumbull, July 7, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[3] New York *Times*, *Herald*, *Tribune*, June 26, 1856, describing Frémont ratification meeting in New York, June 25, 1856. *Times*' account clipped in *Liberator*, July 4, 1856.

Another popular song was called 'BULLY BROOKS'S SONG, As sung by himself, at a private meeting of his friends in Washington, immediately after his attempted assassination of Sumner. Old Uncle Butler presiding.' It was very long. Typical verses are:

'O! my name is BULLY BROOKS,
Bully Brooks, Brooks, Brooks;
O! my name is Bully Brooks,
Ha-ha! ha-ha!
I've strength, if not good looks,
Know bludgeons if not books,
And am the dirtiest of Brooks,
By far — by far!
[Interrupted by drunken chorus from the company:]

The Whigs and 'Americans,' too, were hearty singers. One of their songs, 'THE UNION MARSEILLAISE,' spiritedly expressed, in many verses, the supreme issue as the Whigs saw it:

'Awake! ye men who love your nation —
Her starry standard boldly raise!
Disunion threats its desolation,
And Faction lights her dreadful blaze!
O! shall we tamely list to treason,
And hear our glorious land decried —
Her laws — her charter — all defied
By zealots void of truth or reason?

Chorus: 'Arise! Americans!
The UNION — 'tis your own!
March on! March on! all hearts as one! —
Fillmore and Donelson!' [1]

'Then three cheers for Bully Brooks,
Bully Brooks, Brooks, Brooks!
And three for Bully Keitt,
Hip-hip-hurrah!
Tho' they flogg'd their very mothers,
Stabb'd their sisters or their brothers,
They could count upon the South-ers,
Hurrah! hurrah!'
New York Evening Post, clipped in the *Liberator*, July 4, 1856.

[1] *Conservative*, Aug. 28, 1856.
Another of the many Whig songs, THE NATION'S SONG (Tune — 'Few Days'), was sung at the great Whig meeting at Springfield. It ran:

'Our cause is brightening every day,
Few days, few days,
So "Buck" and Frémont clear the way,
Fillmore's going home;
"Old Buck" is but a quarter nag,
Few days, few days,
And the "Mustang" now begins to fag,
Fillmore's going home.
Oh! the Locos now are sighing,
Few days, few days,
They see there's no use trying,
Fillmore's going home.' — *Ib.*, Aug. 21, 1856.

An 'American song' was:

'There's a good time coming, boys,
A good time coming,
There's a good time coming, boys,
Wait a little longer!
For we shall live to see the day,
When Americans shall have full sway,
In the good time coming!' — *Ib.*, Oct. 2, 1856.

Republican gatherings at important towns were very large — often ten thousand people went to them. Lincoln spoke at one at Princeton where more than that number came.[1] When Trumbull spoke at Jacksonville, the procession was over a mile and a quarter long.[2] A Republican meeting at Danville numbered fifteen thousand and lasted two days.[3] Early in October, twenty thousand attending the State Fair at Alton, together with the population of the town, made up one of the greatest meetings ever seen in the West. Lincoln was the speaker of the day, and the torch-light procession, the bands, the cheering, were immense.[4] A demonstration at Jacksonville, where Lincoln, Herndon, and others spoke from several different stands, was so big and enthusiastic that 'the like was never before equalled in the State.' [5]

In cities, especially at capitals, scores of thousands from all over the State attended Frémont meetings. At a Frémont 'celebration' at Beloit, Wisconsin, thirty thousand came from that State and Illinois, the procession was seven miles long, and in it were two thousand wagons filled with farmers.[6] A Frémont 'rally' at Indianapolis in the middle of July was typical of all in the Frémont campaign, whether held in country, town, or city — typical of the crowds, the spectacles, the frenzy. Special trains, wagons, horses, boats, brought fifty to sixty thousand people at least, reported the *Chicago Tribune*. The procession was hours in passing a given point. A single delegation numbered four thousand five hundred men. Twenty-four Marshals assisted the Grand Marshal. Fifty bands played. Continuous cheers arose. From windows along Washington Street and from the roofs of hotels were 'thousands of fair

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 11, 1856.

[2] *Ib.*, Sept. 29, 1856.

[3] *Ib.*, Aug. 25; *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, Aug. 30, 1856.

[4] *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, Oct. 4, 1856.

[5] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Nov. 3, 1856. The Democrats intimated that the expense for these displays and attractions — free dinners, bands, half fare on railroads, etc. — was 'paid for possibly out of the Kansas fund.' *Rushville* (Ill.) *Times*, Sept. 26, 1856.

[6] *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, Sept. 5, 1856. Everywhere the Republican meetings were very big. One at Muncie, Ind., numbered 20,000. *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, Sept. 30, 1856.

ladies, waving handkerchiefs.' Great flags were suspended across the streets. All day long cannon roared.

The procession was gay with floats. One in the form of a canoe, carried '*thirty-two* beautiful young ladies,' all but one dressed in white, representing the States, while one, 'a very fair girl' shrouded in black crape, personified Kansas. On a banner above the young women was the legend 'OPPOSITION TO OLD BACHELORS.'

A great ball, fifteen feet in diameter, was rolled by a score of men. It was the 'Ball of Freedom,' but was covered with devices showing economic demands: a train of cars (the Pacific railroad) drawn by an engine labelled 'Frémont' which 'was knocking a "Buck" off the track;' another declared for 'Improvement to Rivers and Harbors.' Hundreds of banners had pictures and mottoes expressive of popular Republican thought; a man skinning a buck — 'Frémont the Hunter;' a mustang kicking off a buck's horns; a Border Ruffian holding a rope looped about the neck of a Free-State man who exclaimed 'I die for Freedom;' 'Hoosiers will go for the Pacific Railroad;' 'The White House no Place for an Old Bachelor.'

One section of the parade was made up of Germans. On their banners, and, in their language, were such phrases as 'Free men in the Republic,' 'No man is the property of another,' 'Freedom in a Free State,' 'Let a man be a man,' 'Let the Slave be free,' 'Free Speech and Free Press.'

After the speaking where many orators harangued the crowds from five different stands, another procession of young Republicans, got up to expose 'Democracy,' came down Washington Street. Most were on horseback led by the Devil in black, with horns, cloven feet, and long tail, holding a banner inscribed, 'My works do follow me.' Behind him in a big wagon was Pierce and his cabinet, and after them, mounted on horses, mules, and jackasses, rode two hundred Border Ruffians, outlandishly dressed and armed with all kinds of weapons. Eight oxen drew a boiler in lieu of a cannon.

Then, in another wagon came 'BRIGHAM YOUNG with six wives most fashionably dressed, hoop-skirts and all, each with a little Brigham in her arms,' the Mormon chieftain holding a

banner, 'HURRAH FOR THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL — IT INTRODUCES POLYGAMY AND SLAVERY.' Still another wagon bore a group — 'Bully Brooks' beating prostrate Sumner with a club. At night a torch-light procession two miles long, the marchers four abreast, headed by five brass bands, made Washington Street look like a river of fire, while the thunder of artillery was scarce loud enough to drown the cheers.[1]

No Republican meeting, big or little, was without such entertaining features. In country towns barbecues were a favorite mode of campaign cheer, and throngs gathered about roasted oxen in hilarity and hunger as well as with fervor for freedom. Always the Buchanan-Old Bachelor mottoes appeared; always the floats of girls in white, wreaths of flowers about their brows, with one in black — the States and Kansas; and, sometimes over them floated a great banner with the lines in large letters,

'Who ever heard in all his life,
Of a candidate without a wife?'[2]

Often the reverse of the 'OLD BACHELOR' legend was personified in a way that vastly pleased onlookers — the prettiest girl to be found, as 'Queen of Hearts,' represented 'adored Jessie,' Frémont's lovely and spirited wife.[3] She was the daughter of Benton and, when she was fifteen had eloped with the gallant explorer, who was then twenty-eight.[4] No matter! said Republicans; 'the course of true love never did run smooth.' And had not her parents forgiven them? Who was prouder of his son-in-law than Benton? At any rate, Frémont was not an 'old bachelor.' So 'John and Jessie forever! Hurrah!' Thus another element of romance was added to the Republican standard bearer.

But all was not praise for the 'Pathfinder,' the fighter, the lover; detraction made free with him, too. Frémont's father

[1] Indianapolis Correspondence, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 15, clipped in New York *Times*, July 21, 1856.

[2] *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, Oct. 11, 1856, describing a Frémont rally at Peoria, where Lincoln spoke.

[3] *Era:* Cole, 148; *Rushville* (Ill.) *Times*, Sept. 26, 1856.

[4] They were married Oct. 19, 1841. Protestant clergymen refused to perform the ceremony, but the infatuated couple persisted and finally were married by a Catholic priest, one father Horsey, at Georgetown.

was a French adventurer, who, after long and thrilling experiences, reached Norfolk, Virginia. There he taught French, and made love to a beautiful and passionate young woman who was the wife of a rich old man, an officer of the Revolution. A divorce resulted, she married Frémont, and the two made off in a wagon on a journey among the Indians of the Southern States, camping by the roadside on their way. At one such stop near Savannah John C. Frémont was born.

When he became the Republican candidate, these facts were raked up. It was said that the father never took out naturalization papers, never became an American citizen; that the birth of the son was irregular; that the marriage came too late. In a speech in Richmond Governor Wise of Virginia publicly charged that Frémont was '*born illegitimately in a neighboring State, if not ill begotten in this very city.*' [1] All over the South that accusation was believed, and so much was said about it in the North, that Frémont newspapers took note of it. Even if true, what difference did it make? asked the New York *Times* in a long, leading editorial; it was not Frémont's fault in any case.

Thus, while Kansas and Freedom were made the dominant note of all Republican meetings, the domestic lives of Buchanan and of Frémont were contrasted, and this personal phase was appreciable in the campaign. Far stronger were attacks on Mormonism and polygamy. But next to the stricken Territory, Border Ruffians, and the arrogant Slaveocracy as personified by 'Bully Brooks,' the most effective Republican appeal was economic. No meeting, no procession was without reference to the Pacific railroad and to the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Nor were increasing hard times without influence — very great influence. It needed only the climax of this growing financial distress, which came in the North (though not in the South) the very next year in the panic of 1857, and the declaration for a protective tariff to foster Northern manufacturers, which the Republicans neglected to make in 1856 — it needed only these

[1] New York *Times*, Oct. 6; *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Oct. 28, 1856. 'Tell me if the hoisting of the black flag over you by a Frenchman's bastard, while the arms of civil war are already clashing, is not to be deemed an overt act and a declaration of war?'

things, in addition to anti-slavery agitation and the other factors enumerated to make Republican victory thereafter certain in the North.

But in the Frémont campaign the 'talking points' of the new party were liberty, monogamy, and 'righteousness' in general. 'Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Speech, Free Men, Frémont' was the Republican motto and battle cry.[1]

Democratic meetings were also vociferous, also big. At one in Jacksonville there were 'Democrats by acres,' and the shouts and cheers were absolutely deafening.[2] Douglas spoke to six thousand people at Bloomington,[3] to ten thousand at Decatur.[4] Always his theme was 'the Constitution and the Union' which, said he, the 'Black Republican Party' would destroy, and the maintenance of law which it flouted. Indeed, the Douglas Democracy of 1856 preached the Union, and talked the Union, more than did the Republicans; and we shall see such Northern Democrats, under Lincoln as Commander-in-Chief, make good their faith on battlefields. Their bitterest partisan charge now was that the new party consisted of the 'woolly host of disunion.' [5]

The *State Register* boasted that twenty thousand came to hear Douglas at Springfield; the roads to the capital were crowded for miles. The parade far exceeded any like procession by the Republicans in Central Illinois. Besides bands of music from Springfield and towns in adjacent counties, one came from St. Louis. A float covered with blue cloth spangled with stars carried little girls representing the States; while on the biggest float was a large gilded eagle and a great banner on which was inscribed in golden letters: 'THE UNION: THE FATHERS OF '76 WON IT. FATHERS OF 1856 PRESERVE IT.' [6]

Nor were the Whig and Know-Nothing meetings small. Indeed, throughout Central and Southern Illinois they rivalled those of the Democrats and far exceeded those of the Republi-

[1] *Douglas:* Johnson, 147.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Register*, Sept. 15, 1856.

[3] *Ib.*, Sept. 18, 1856. [4] *Ib.*, Oct. 13, 1856. [5] *Ib.*, July 29, 1856.

[6] *Ib.*, Sept. 19, 1856. Other Democratic mottoes were: 'Keep Step to the Music of the Union'; 'White Supremacy'; 'No Negro Equality'; 'The Constitution is our Highest Law,' etc.

cans in numbers and noise. On October 10 they held a meeting at Springfield attended by fifteen or twenty thousand [1] — 'ten times larger than the Frémont gathering and something less than the democratic gathering recently held here,' gleefully reported the Douglas organ. 'One thing is evident,' continued the *State Register;* 'Lincoln has met with a perfect rout in Sangamon.' He, Herndon, and others 'have found out, by this demonstration, that the old line whigs cannot be governed exclusively by the negro question.' [2] And so it turned out. On the cold, rainy election day, Buchanan carried Sangamon County by more than two to one over Frémont, who got nearly five hundred fewer votes even than Fillmore.[3]

In this political state of things, Lincoln went to every meeting he could reach, where he thought he could make votes. Everywhere his tall, bony figure rose above the crowds. Always men thronged about him to hear his peculiar tales, laughing uproariously and slapping thighs. From a distance women admired. When time came for him to speak, off went Lincoln's coat and stock, revealing his trousers, always too short, held by a knit gallus, perhaps attached to the 'pants' by a peg instead of a button, his long, scrawny neck protruding from a cotton shirt that opened behind.

His sentences were short, words plain, illustrations familiar and simple, and in his speech and manner there was never the least trace of the pompous. Others spoke mostly of atrocities, horrors, reeking bludgeons, blood-thirsty 'Ruffians' — of anything that could arouse passion and stir up hatred. But not Lincoln! Although he made plain the wrong of slavery and the necessity that Kansas must be free, no abuse fell from his lips. If any fault can be found with his speeches in the Frémont campaign, it is his frequent reference to 'that man Douglas,' made in the temper of Lincoln's attack on Douglas in 1852.[4]

No matter how many spoke at any meeting, Lincoln sur-

[1] *Conservative,* Oct. 16, 1856. [2] *Illinois Daily State Register,* Oct. 11, 1856.

[3] *Ib.,* Nov. 7, 1856. Buchanan, 2475; Fillmore, 1612; Frémont, 1174.

[4] See Vol. III, Chap. III.

The *Illinois State Journal,* beginning in June, 1856, published a series of anonymous letters to 'B. Arnold Douglas,' and that name was frequently used in its news items and editorials.

passed the best of them. At Belleville, for instance, where Trumbull and four others addressed great throngs, the local paper declared that 'the palm, however, belongs to Mr. Lincoln.' He even did better than at the Bloomington Convention, the editor assured the 'delighted thousands' who heard him at Belleville.[1]

Lincoln's principal theme was the Constitution and freedom, liberty, and Union. He recited Webster's grand peroration in his reply to Hayne, albeit without giving Webster credit.[2] His main appeal was for the preservation of the Union without war, if possible, but, if necessary, by force.

He made the same speech everywhere; but when he could do so without scaring away Whig voters, Lincoln put in the assertion that the Nation could not continue to exist half slave and half free. No report has been found that he used the Biblical quotation, 'A house divided against itself cannot stand,' but, throughout the campaign, whenever politically expedient, he made the point.

Everywhere Lincoln was careful to answer the Whig and Democratic charge that the new party was sectional and a menace to the Union. Again and at greater length he wrote out for the press that part of his speech.

'More than all others,' said Lincoln, that charge caused opponents of slavery extension 'to hesitate' to vote for Frémont; 'practically, it is the most difficult objection we have to meet.' What was the real issue between the parties led respectively by Buchanan and Frémont? 'Simply this: "Shall slavery be allowed to extend into United States territories now legally free?" Buchanan says it shall, and Frémont says it shall not.'

That was the 'naked issue and the whole of it,' he insisted. Of course each party made charges against the other of ulterior designs; 'but as these charges cannot be fully proved either way,' let them be dismissed and the discussion confined to the main issue.

[1] *Belleville Advocate*, Oct. 22, 1856.

[2] 'I heard him.' Democratic letter from Petersburg to *Illinois Daily State Register*, Sept. 1, in issue Sept. 4, 1856.

On that question — slavery extension — how was one side more sectional than the other? Lincoln asked. If both were equally sectional, national men gained nothing by changing sides. The alternative was simple — let those who were for slavery extension go to Buchanan, and those who were against it go to Frémont.

The fact that both the Republican candidates were from free States, meant 'excessive sectionalism' to some men and they became angry and excited about it; but, said Lincoln, 'the Constitution remains calm — keeps cool — upon the subject.' The Constitution did not say that one candidate must come from a slave State and the other from a free State. That had been the custom, he admitted, but it had not always been done. Again Lincoln gave the three examples that he had given at Galena.

Suppose Frémont's friends did expect to elect him, if at all, 'principally by free-State votes?' So did 'Buchanan's friends expect to elect him, if at all, chiefly by slave-State votes.'

It was true, conceded Lincoln, that the Republicans could get no votes in the slave States, while the Democrats would get most of their votes in the South, and a great many in the North, too. It was that fact which gave most color to the charge that the Republican Party was sectional.

Why was it so? asked Lincoln. Surely not because of any difference in the 'mental or moral structure of the people North and South.' The real reason, he insisted, was that the Southern people have 'an immediate palpable and immensely great pecuniary interest, while with the people of the North it is merely an abstract question of moral right, with only slight and remote pecuniary interest added.'

The slaves were worth 'a thousand million dollars' and their market value would be doubled if slavery were extended, Lincoln argued. That was why the Southern people were united 'as one man' for slavery extension. But the Northern people were moved by 'moral principle' alone — a 'looser bond than pecuniary interest,' which influenced the people of the South.

'Right here is the cause of their perfect union and our want of it,' said Lincoln. And see how it worked in politics! If a

Southern man wished to be President, the South choked him down, so that the prize could be 'held up on Southern terms to the greedy eyes of Northern ambition.' Thus Democratic conventions had become mere auctions where the South knocked down Presidential nominations to the highest bidder.

Lincoln then gave his long and pet illustration of how the Democratic politicians ruled by the South, kept their voters in line by the cry, 'stand by the party' and 'support party measures.' See how Douglas had in that way wrung from the Legislature approval of his Kansas-Nebraska bill — an endorsement 'given, not in the sense of right, but in the teeth of a sense of wrong, to sustain Douglas.' By the same method, New England had been divided with Pierce, Michigan with Cass, Pennsylvania with Buchanan — 'and all for the Democratic party.'

Yet, after thus dividing the North, the Democrats call the Republicans sectional! exclaimed Lincoln. The impudence of it! It would be funny if it were not so serious.

Lincoln closed with grave words, portentous words. Taken with his letter to Robertson, and his statements at Bloomington and Galena, they could mean but one thing:

'This *is* a sectional question — that is to say, it is a question in its nature calculated to divide the American people geographically. . . . Who is to blame for that? Who can help it?

'Either side can help it; [1] but how? Simply by yielding to the other side; there is no other way; in the whole range of possibility there is no other way.

'Then, which side shall yield? To this again, there can be but one answer — the side which is in the wrong. . . .

'Let all who really think slavery ought to be spread into free territory, openly go over against us; there is where they rightfully belong. But why should any go who really think slavery ought not to spread?

'Do they really think the right ought to yield to the wrong? Are they afraid to stand by the right?

'Do they fear that the Constitution is too weak to sustain them in the right? Do they really think that by right surrender-

[1] In all editions of Lincoln's Works the word 'help' is printed 'hold.' This was an error of the typesetter of the country newspaper; and the mistake has been copied.

ing to wrong the hopes of our Constitution, our Union, and our liberties can possibly be bettered.' [1]

Not by speeches alone, did Lincoln appeal to the unwilling Whigs. Among thousands of them was rising that old party spirit to which Lincoln himself had in former times so often and so passionately appealed. Whig meetings were becoming larger and more frequent. Even Herndon was alarmed, although he looked upon the Fillmore movement as a split, 'considerable and deep,' between the Republicans 'or Anti-Nebraska men' and the Know-Nothings.[2] Judd thought that in Central Illinois the Republicans were more like 'guerillas than regular soldiers.' [3] Something had to be done more intimate and effective than speeches. Lincoln did it.

He wrote personal letters to Whig friends, striving to prove that the race was between Frémont and Buchanan, and that a vote for Fillmore would help the Democratic candidate. No wonder the Democrats were glad that so many Whigs were supporting Fillmore — 'they know where the shoe pinches.' Lincoln said that he understood the relative strength of the three parties in Illinois 'as well as any one man does,' and he predicted that Buchanan would win solely because the opposition to him was divided between Frémont and Fillmore, whereas Bissell was sure of election because Whigs and Republicans were united in support of him.[4]

But there was no time to write many of these letters and hosts of Whigs needed such personal attention. So Lincoln got up a circular letter, wrote the word 'Confidential' at the top of it, the Republican State Committee had it carefully lithographed and, from Springfield, it was sent to leading Whigs. It was an amazing performance.

'Every vote withheld from Frémont and given to Fillmore in this State actually lessens Fillmore's chance of being President,'

[1] *Works*, II, 299–307.

[2] Herndon to Trumbull, July 29, 1856. Trumbull MSS.

[3] Judd to Palmer, Aug. 3, 1856. *Ib.*

[4] Lincoln to John Bennett, Aug. 4, 1856. *Works*, II, 295–6.
'He [Lincoln] had a more accurate knowledge of public opinion in central Illinois than any other man who visited the Committee rooms.' *Address:* White, 20. White was Secretary of the Republican State Central Committee.

he wrote. For if Buchanan got all the slave States, Pennsylvania, 'and *any* other State,' he would be elected; but if Fillmore won in Maryland and Kentucky, Buchanan would be beaten, the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives, and Fillmore *might* be chosen. If, however, the Fillmore men should 'throw away . . . on him' enough votes in Indiana and Illinois to give those States to Buchanan, that would more than make up for his loss of Maryland and Kentucky.

This, argued Lincoln, 'is as plain as adding up the weight of three small hogs.' Since Fillmore had 'no possible chance' to win in Illinois, the best thing for him was 'to let Frémont take it,' and thus keep it out of the hands of Buchanan.

'Buchanan is the hard horse to beat in this race,' Lincoln wrote to his Whig friends. 'Let him have Illinois, and nothing can beat him; and he will get Illinois if men persist in throwing away votes upon Mr. Fillmore.'

It was sheer nonsense to suppose that Fillmore could carry the State, said Lincoln. Look at the newspapers against Buchanan; all were for Frémont save, indeed, three or four which were for Fillmore. That was a 'fair index of the proportion of the votes.' At least two of the Fillmore papers were maintained, partly at least, by Democrats — and no wonder, for 'they know the Fillmore movement helps them, and therefore they help it.'[1]

But alas for the well meant if devious plan! An accident of politics upset it. Worse still, that political mischance caused many of the ungodly to laugh at Lincoln, and the incident did him no good then or thereafter.

At a country Whig meeting in a grove an old Whig called several of his party friends aside to consult with them about something which, he said, puzzled and troubled him. He pledged them to secrecy for, said he, the matter was 'confidential' — no one must know about it. All promised to be discreet, to be silent.

Gravely the old farmer took from his pocket Lincoln's letter, and carefully unfolding it, handed it to one of the group. He

[1] Lincoln to Harrison Maltby, Springfield, Sept. 8, 1856. 'Confidential.' *Works*, II, 297–8. At the time Lincoln wrote this letter, it had been suggested by the *Richmond Whig* that the election might be thrown into the House. *New York Herald*, Aug. 11, 1856 — long editorial. The *Herald* vigorously supported Frémont.

began to read, then stopped, laughed and passed the letter on with like result. Soon all were chuckling and each took from his pocket an identical letter.[1]

In due time, the story reached Springfield. The town grinned — the joke was on Lincoln. The *State Register* rejoiced and denounced; the *Conservative* spat venom. Here, said both papers, was the apostle of righteousness and fair dealing, caught at a cheap campaign trick unworthy of a bad schoolboy. 'We pity Mr. Lincoln, for verily his abolition taskmasters are requiring dirty work at his hands,' sneered the Democratic organ, when publishing 'this precious "confidential" document.' [2]

A Coles County Whig and Know-Nothing wrote an open letter to the two Springfield papers: 'Who ever heard of such treachery before?' The Fillmore men 'infinitely prefer the election of Buchanan to the election of the woolly horse.[3] . . . The Frémont party . . . are on their last legs, or Abe Lincoln, Lovejoy, Wentworth, and other unscrupulous and corrupt demagogues in our state, would not write and send broadcast over Illinois their secret and patchie appeals to . . . delude and seduce the Fillmore men into the support of their mongrel abolition ticket.' [4]

Such, said the *Conservative*, was the response of honest men 'to the secret and "confidential" lithographed circular which Mr. Lincoln, the leading Republican candidate for Elector and prospective candidate for the United States Senate, is scattering broad-cast over the country by this under-ground process. . . . So far as we can learn, Lincoln's silly circular has been a flash in the pan.' [5]

The arguments set out in these letters were also a part of Lincoln's speech at meetings where many Whigs came. And he

[1] The *Conservative*, Oct. 16, 1856.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Register*, Oct. 13, 1856.

[3] Frémont. A shrewd Yankee found in Maryland a horse 'with a remarkable coat of hair — long, shaggy, and bearing a striking resemblance to wool.' He exhibited it in Washington as a 'woolly horse' which had been taken on the plains by Colonel Frémont and was regarded as the 'greatest living curiosity of the age.' Benton denounced the show as a fraud and had the exhibitor thrown into prison. *Bench and Bar of Missouri:* W. V. N. Bay, 12–3.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Register*, Oct. 14; *Conservative*, Oct. 16, 1856.

[5] *Ib.*, Oct. 16, 1856.

made still another point everywhere — a point which appealed with tremendous power to farmers, and to all wage-earners who, as such, had begun to show class consciousness and to organize. For the first time in our history bids for the labor vote, as such, were made. He spoke, not for the black man, said Senator John P. Hale of New Hampshire in a speech at Galesburg, Illinois, but for the 'fair haired, ruddy cheeked Saxon — to plead the cause of the laboring class' which was endangered by slavery.[1] So, too, spoke most Republican orators — free labor must be saved from the 'Slave Power,' and therefore must vote for Frémont. Lincoln said the same thing, and meant it.

The opportunity for making these appeals to labor, as a class, was furnished by the increasing financial stringency and unemployment throughout the North. Also, the Republicans charged that Buchanan had said that ten cents a day was enough for the workingman; and small, feeble, and void of imagination was the Republican procession that was without a wagon filled with ragged, starving laborers toiling at various jobs with a tattered sign over them '*Buchanan Workshop: Ten Cents a Day.*'[2] It was a frank class appeal and was a vital part of the Republican campaign. '10 cent Jimmy,' the *Indianapolis Journal* called the Democratic candidate in an abusive editorial on Buchanan's hatred of the 'working classes.'[3]

But the pretext for arousing Northern labor against the 'Slaveocracy' and Buchanan, lay in certain wild statements then appearing in a small group of the Southern press. Six or seven papers in that section, all of them as radical for slavery as the *Liberator* was for emancipation, had accepted the theory of Fitzhugh's book and were advocating it — the theory that slavery was the natural and necessary condition of all labor regardless of color, and that capital should own labor.[4] All such editorials that could be found were collected, and Republican papers printed them under alarming headlines.

[1] *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, Oct. 27, 1856.

[2] *Ib.*, Oct. 11, 1856, and other Frémont papers during the campaign. Such a burlesque was a conspicuous feature of the great Frémont procession at Indianapolis, described in the text.

[3] *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, Sept. 27, 1856.

[4] See Vol. III, 31.

The *State Journal* made display of them with the caption 'THE BUCHANAN DEMOCRACY HATE FREEDOM:' 'The laws of the slave States justify the holding of white men in bondage;' The North is 'burdened with a servile class of mechanics and laborers, unfit for self-government;' 'Master and slave is a relation in society as necessary as that of parent and child; . . . If free society be unnatural, immoral, unchristian, it must fall and give way to a slave society — a system as old as the world. . . . Two opposite and conflicting forms of society cannot, among civilized men, co-exist and endure. The one must give way and cease to exist — the other become universal' — such were statements credited to Southern papers by name.[1] 'What balderdash!' cried the *State Register;*[2] but with much effect Lincoln made use of them.[3]

The worst of these excerpts he cut out and pasted in his campaign scrap-book. It was a paragraph from a small country paper in Alabama, the *Muscogee Herald.*[4] 'Free society! We sicken of the name! What is it but a conglomeration of greasy mechanics, filthy operatives, small fisted farmers, and moonstruck theorists? All the Northern and especially the New England States, are devoid of society fitted for well-bred gentlemen. The prevailing class one meets is that of mechanics struggling to be genteel, and small farmers who do their own drudgery; and yet who are hardly fit for association with a Southern gentleman's body-servant. This is your free society which the Northern hordes are endeavoring to extend into Kansas.'

But merely to print such matter in the party press and to quote it on the stump was not enough to suit Lincoln. Demo-

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal,* July 30, Aug. 19, Oct. 15, 1856.

[2] Aug. 1, 1856.

[3] An editorial in the *State Journal,* Aug. 19, 1856, probably written by Lincoln, said: 'The southern aristocrats . . . stick up their noses at our free laborers. . . . At the north . . . a man is regarded *for what he is.* . . . The southern party who now are supporting Mr. Buchanan . . . do not stop with exhibitions of their superfluous and sneering contempt for free laborers, but they even advocate that the honest toiler should be reduced to the same degradation with their slaves. . . .

'Laborers, mechanics, artisans, merchants, clerks! What reply do you give to such insults as these.'

[4] Clipped in *ib.,* Oct. 15, 1856.

cratic papers scoffed and Democratic speakers jeered at it as unfair, if not untruthful. Also, the Whigs took little or no stock in it. Herndon showed to Lincoln an article in the *Richmond Enquirer* endorsing the principle that the enslavement of either whites or blacks was justifiable and right. If only 'some of these Illinois newspapers would champion that,' it could be made use of with greater effect, Lincoln confided to his partner. Herndon said he could manage it; he was a friend of the editor of a 'pro-slavery organ' in Springfield, and would get him to do that very thing.

All right, 'go in,' said Lincoln. So the *Conservative* printed the 'white slave' passage from the *Richmond Enquirer*, although with a blazing editorial denouncing it.[1] For the rest of the campaign, Lincoln used the incident 'with telling effect.' The editor found out who played the 'trick' upon him, relates Herndon, and thereafter neither he nor Lincoln could ever get 'another line in the paper.' [2]

Thus throughout the North, with argument and song, with blare of bands, rattle of drums and roar of cannon, with parading and cheering and banners and mottoes and devices of burlesque, with torchlight processions and uniformed companies marching as to war, with charges of sectionalism and counter charges of disunion, with many a trick by all sides, the campaign of 1856 came to an end.

In comparison, the South had been quiet — dangerously quiet. Even the strident voices of 'fire-eaters' did not arouse general display of Southern emotion, when contrasted with the thunderous response to inflammatory incitement of Northern feeling. But the Southern mind was made up, Southern purpose fixed. If the Nation were to be ruled by a sectional Administration, the South would set up for itself.

That this would happen four years later, was made almost certain by the result of the election. Buchanan won by a narrow margin, a margin almost sure to be wiped out in 1860. Although the Democratic candidate got a heavy vote in every Northern State, he carried only four States in that section, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois. Frémont won in all other

[1] Aug. 28, 1856. [2] Herndon, II, 370–1.

Northern States, but he lost California, by more than two to one. Even Fillmore beat Frémont by over sixteen thousand votes in the State of the Pathfinder's principal exploits — but California had only four electoral votes anyway. In the whole South fewer than a thousand votes were cast for the standard bearer of the 'Sectional Party,' as the anti-Republican Whigs, 'Americans,' and Democrats everywhere, as well as the whole Southern people, then called the Republicans.[1]

Moreover, the three Northern States that gave Buchanan the victory were moving with speed toward the Republican Party. While Illinois, for instance, gave the Democratic candidate over one hundred and five thousand votes, Frémont got ninety-six thousand, Fillmore over thirty-seven thousand, and Bissell actually carried the State, as Lincoln had predicted he would, by a majority of five thousand. If all Illinois Whigs and Americans who voted for Fillmore in 1856 should support the Republican Party in 1860 and like gains be made throughout the North, that section would be solidly Republican and would elect the next President by a majority of Northern votes without a single vote from the South.

Should that take place, a Southern Confederacy would be formed and, if necessary, defended by arms. That outcome was announced hundreds of times during the Frémont campaign, and stated in frank and bold, if not unkind terms. But during that contest Lincoln had often said, as if speaking for the North to the South: 'We don't want to dissolve the Union, and if you attempt it, we won't let you. With the purse and sword, the army, navy and treasury at our command, you could not do it.'[2]

The element that elected Buchanan was the old line Whigs. Tens of thousands of them, like Choate, voted for him in terror of the Republican Party, and as the best way of beating it. Many did this in Illinois. In the country as a whole, almost nine hundred thousand Whigs and 'Americans' voted for Fill-

[1] Kentucky, 314, Maryland, 281, Virginia, 291, McKee, 103. This fact was made much of by all anti-Republican newspapers. For example, the *Cincinnati Enquirer* said: 'All can now see how unfortunate it would have been if the "sectional" party had triumphed and had sought to administer the government upon its basis.' Clipped in *Illinois Daily State Register*, Jan. 12, 1857.

[2] Page 17, *supra*.

more. Nearly three hundred thousand of these votes were cast in Northern States.

But Fillmore's heaviest vote, most evenly distributed, was in the South — nearly twenty-one thousand in Louisiana, twenty-four thousand in Mississippi, twenty-eight thousand in Alabama, thirty-six thousand in North Carolina, forty-two thousand in Georgia, forty-eight thousand in Missouri, sixty thousand in Virginia, sixty-six thousand in Tennessee, sixty-seven thousand in Kentucky; and he actually carried Maryland. South Carolina cast her eight votes, chosen by the Legislature, for Buchanan.

These Fillmore votes, North and South, were cast, chiefly as a protest against a sectional party, against radicalism, against the possibility of war. If that vote should fall off during the coming four years, if anything should happen that would divide it between the Democratic and the Republican parties, or would add greatly to Republican strength from any quarter or for any cause, the lines were drawn, the die was cast, and an attempt at disunion as certain as sunset.

Such decisive events did come to pass, and we shall now see how Lincoln met them.

CHAPTER II

THE DRED SCOTT DECISION

Let us re-inaugurate the good old 'central ideas' of the republic, . . . not that 'all States as States are equal,' nor yet that 'all citizens as citizens are equal,' but to renew the broader, better declaration, including both these and much more, that 'all men are created equal!' LINCOLN, Dec. 10, 1856.

At the time of the Declaration of Independence . . . and for more than a century before, they [negroes] had been regarded as so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect. Chief Justice TANEY, March 6, 1857.

DEMOCRATIC and Republican leaders gave opposite interpretation of the election of Buchanan.

The opinion of the victors was best stated by President Pierce in his message to Congress, December 2, 1856. The meaning of the election, said the President, was that the country had repudiated the 'sectional party' whose course led to civil war, 'burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations.' See how the leaders of that party were teaching disrespect for the Constitution, defiance of the laws, contempt for the Courts; educating the people 'to stand face to face as enemies, rather than shoulder to shoulder as friends;' and thus undermining the Union itself. Those leaders pretended only to oppose the extension of slavery into the Territories, but their real purpose was to destroy it in the States as well. Many who 'inconsiderately' had joined the sectional party loved the Nation and shrank from the thought of war; but that was the end of the road upon which they had been misled by unscrupulous men.

How absurd to say that slavery would go everywhere unless barred by national law! Did that system, then, have so much more natural vigor than free labor? There never would have been trouble in Kansas but for 'propagandist colonization' and outside interference. Nebraska was proof of that. But all was now peace in Kansas. The attempt to set up a 'revolutionary government' there, urged and financed by outsiders, had utterly failed. Exaggerated reports of turmoil and bloodshed in that

Territory had been made — the whole of it had been hardly more than had taken place in 'single cities' in the States.

So, said the President, the people, disgusted with sectional contention, recoiling from the prospect of civil war, determined to maintain the Constitution and uphold the American system as established by the Fathers, had declared for the equality of States as States, of citizens as citizens regardless of religion or birthplace, and for the inviolability of the rights of the sections.

Bold, direct, aggressive as these charges and statements of the President were, they were surpassed by his positive and repeated assertion that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. In view of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case which was to come three months later, this pronouncement of the President on December 2, 1856, was, by far, the most important in his notable message.

Pierce was leaving public life forever; there was not even the possibility of a hope that he could be President again; at the Cincinnati Convention the South had left him for Douglas; he was going back to his New Hampshire home and that State had become almost as fierce as Massachusetts against slavery and the South. If any man ever was free from political influence, Franklin Pierce was unbound and untrammelled when he wrote his last annual message to Congress.[1]

In this situation, the President affirmed with boldness and vigor that the Missouri Compromise had violated the Constitution. In a review of what he called 'indirect aggression' upon the South from the North — agitation for emancipation, aid to runaway slaves, State laws to thwart the national statute, interference with normal migration to the Territories — the President took up the vexed question of the Missouri Compromise.

It had been 'acquiesced in rather than approved by the States,' he said; the North had broken it time and again; when it was repealed it had no 'binding virtue' whatever; it never was more than a Congressional enactment by the familiar pro-

[1] After Pierce's term expired, Davis wrote his former chief the politician's usual polite letter about the many friends who were still for him for President again; but the former President answered that he did not want the office and could not get it if he did want it. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, x, 360–1.

cess of legislative compromise. Four times, in a long and detailed analysis, the President, emphatically and aggressively, asserted that the Missouri Compromise had been null and void from the first. In the light of what follows, it cannot be repeated too often, that these direct statements of the President were the weightiest part of his remarkable message.[1]

Such was the Democratic view of the situation after the election of 1856: the people had not only rebuked the sectional movement and declared against the war in which that movement if successful would result, but they had approved the conduct of the Administration, including the repeal of the 'unconstitutional' Missouri Compromise.

What, now, was the Republican view of the meaning of the election and of the political state of things? Leaders of the new party everywhere expressed that view; but none of them made it so simple and clear as did Lincoln. Throughout the North, Republican banquets were held during the winter of 1856–57. These gatherings were 'love-feasts' of rejoicing over State and local election victories. On December 10, 1856, one of them was given at the Tremont House in Chicago. Three hundred guests were there, practically all from Northern Illinois, most of them from Chicago itself. However, 'it was an assemblage of heroes, fresh from the field of fight and fame, with the laurels of victory on their brow,' reported an enthusiastic Republican paper.[2]

Everything good to eat and drink which then could be found in Chicago — 'every luxury,' said the newspapers — was on the tables. The editor of the *Illinois State Journal*, who was there, declared that 'the vocabulary of superlatives' could not do justice to the occasion, and that his readers would have to draw upon their imagination to fill this picture. The banquet began at eight o'clock and lasted 'until after the watch-dial pointed to the beginning of another day.' At the ends of the hall, long and broad American flags were draped; upon one was put the motto 'LIBERTY AND UNION,' upon the other 'ILLINOIS REDEEMED.' A glee club sang lively songs and at intervals a band played in a way that was positively 'soul-stirring.'

Letters from Seward, Chase, Trumbull, and other party

[1] *Messages:* Richardson, v, 397–407. [2] *Chicago Democratic Press*, Dec. 11, 1856.

chieftains were 'received with loud bursts of applause.' Responses were made to thirteen regular toasts, among them a toast to Frémont, to Bissell, to the Republican Party, to a Free Press, to States' Rights, to Our Adopted Citizens, to Illinois, to 'Kansas — the power behind the throne, is greater than the throne itself. Kansas will be free.'

The last toast on the printed program was: '1860! — THERE'S A GOOD TIME COMING BOYS!'

After these and other formal toasts had been drunk and responses made, many other sentiments were volunteered amid the approving shouts of the happy diners, who grew ever more genial and expressive as the gay hours wore on.

The first toast on the formal list was: 'THE UNION — *The North* will maintain it — the South will not depart therefrom;' and to this sentiment Lincoln spoke. His speech was incomparably the best made on that jubilant night. 'There is no man upon whom they [the Republicans of Illinois] would so gladly confer the highest honors within their gift,' wrote the editor of the party organ at Springfield, 'and I trust an opportunity may not long be wanting which will enable them to place him in a station that seems to be by universal consent conceded to him and which he is so admirably qualified by nature to adorn.' [1]

Lincoln rose to respond 'amid almost deafening cheers.' The Republican Party was for the Union, he began, and again cheers broke out. If it had been 'entirely successful, it would have been the friend of the Union more than ever. [Loud and long continued cheers.] . . . As Webster said "Not Union without liberty, nor liberty without Union; but Union and liberty, now and forever, one and inseparable." [Loud cheers.]'

When Lincoln spoke of Bissell, Governor-elect, there was a demonstration — 'Loud and long continued cheers and waving of handkerchiefs.' The speaker told two stories which brought shouts of laughter from the cheerful and cheery banqueters, although they are not very amusing in print.[2]

[1] *Illinois State Journal*, Dec. 13, 1856.

[2] These stories were illustrative of the Democratic predicament with reference to the Governor-elect and his determined character. The Democrats were saying that Bissell could not take the oath of office. They would learn better, said Lincoln. The Democrats reminded him of a 'darkey' who had gone into a hollow tree, leaving another

Then Lincoln launched into an attack on the President's message. Pierce was 'like a rejected lover making merry at the wedding of his rival,' said Lincoln. The people elect Buchanan! Pierce forgot that only a minority voted for the Democratic candidate — a minority of about four hundred thousand. Frémont men had not been duped as the President charged; it was Pierce, who wanted a second term, who had been duped. 'He is the cat's-paw.' So long had Pierce dragged others' chestnuts out of the fire that 'his claws are burnt off to the gristle, and he is thrown aside as unfit for further use. As the fool said of King Lear, when his daughters had turned him out of doors, "He's a shelled peascod."' [1]

It was false, Lincoln asserted, that the Republican Party wanted to abolish slavery in the South or to weaken the Constitution and laws, as Pierce had said. 'I pronounce the charge an unmixed and unmitigated falsehood!' Ours is a Government by public opinion and can be changed only as that controlling influence is changed. Public opinion always formed about 'a central idea.' Until recently that dominant thought had been 'the equality of men;' and although, 'as a matter of actual necessity,' the public mind had yielded to existing inequalities, public opinion had made steady advance toward 'the practical equality of all men.'

In the late campaign, Lincoln continued, one party had striven to overthrow that central idea and establish the opposite idea that 'slavery is right in the abstract.' Not only might that idea result in the perpetuation of human bondage but in 'its extension to all countries and colors.' The phrase, State equal-

'darkey' outside. A bear put its head in the hole and the negro outside caught hold of its tail. 'What was darkening de hole?' asked the negro in the tree. 'Ah!' cried the other darkey, . . . "if de tail breaks you'll find out." [Laughter and cheers.]'

Lincoln explained: 'These darkies at Springfield see something darkening the hole, but wait till the tail breaks on the first of January [when Bissell would be inaugurated], and they will see. [Cheers.]'

Lincoln's other story was about a boy 'who was talking to another as to whether General Jackson could ever get to Heaven. Said the boy, "He'd get there if he had a mind to." [Cheers and laughter.]' So it was with Colonel Bissell, said Lincoln; 'he'd do whatever he had a mind to. [Cheers.]' *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, Dec. 11, 1856. The descriptions of this banquet are from that paper and from the *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Dec. 13, 1856.

[1] 'That's a shealed peascod.' *King Lear*, I, 4, 219.

ity, which the President had extolled so highly, was a mere 'catch-phrase,' invented by the *Richmond Enquirer*, 'an avowed advocate of slavery, regardless of color.' Although Pierce thought that the 'new central idea' had prevailed, the majority of the people had not yet endorsed it and, Lincoln added, we 'hope they never will.'

But at the polls 'we were divided between Frémont and Fillmore,' Lincoln said; and that assertion was the heart of his speech as it was of all Republican explanations of Buchanan's success. Lincoln and other Republican leaders assumed that the million men who had voted for the Whig and Know-Nothing candidate in 1856 were opposed to slavery or to the extension of it. This, of course, was far from true, since few if any of the hundreds of thousands of Fillmore supporters in the South were against slavery, and since many in the North, like Stuart and other old line Whigs of Central Illinois, were irreconcilably opposed to the Republican Party. But it was sound political strategy to declare that all those who voted for Fillmore or for Frémont, stood for the same thing; and Lincoln said so, not bothering his hearers or himself about the niceties of exact fact.

So, he continued, 'can we not come together for the future?' Let bygones be bygones, and 'let every one who really believes, and is resolved, that free society is not and shall not be a failure, and who can conscientiously declare that in the past contest he has done only what he thought best — let every such one have charity to believe that every other one can say as much.' Thus Lincoln appealed to his fellow partisans of former days, who had refused to go with him into the new party, who, as we have seen, felt bitterly toward him, and still held out against him.

With lofty yet touching eloquence Lincoln closed: 'Let past differences as nothing be; and with steady eye on the real issue, let us reinaugurate the good old "central ideas" of the republic. We can do it. The human heart is with us; God is with us. We shall again be able not to declare that "all States as States are equal," nor yet that "all citizens as citizens are equal," but to renew the broader, better declaration, including both these and much more, that "all men are created equal."' [1]

[1] *Works*, II, 308–12.

Cheers rang out and rang again and again when Lincoln thus finished his speech.[1] Others spoke to the toasts assigned to them, and dull was the sentence that did not draw applause from that eager audience. So with much oratory, much shouting, much singing by the glee club and music by the band until midnight, the Republican banquet of jollification and hope came to an end.

Just as the most striking part of Pierce's message was his repeated assertion that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional, so the most significant thing about Lincoln's speech was his omission to make any reference whatever to that subject. Although he was replying to the President, attacking the Democratic position, and announcing the Republican program, Lincoln said nothing about the aggressively asserted unconstitutionality of the 'sacred compact,' the repeal of which he had so sternly assailed and the judicial announcement of which he, in common with all Republican leaders and the whole press of the party, was thereafter to make so great an issue.

The President's attack and Lincoln's silence are equally startling. It would seem that Lincoln did not think the matter important; or else that he did not think of it at all; but that he considered that pleas for Union and equality in the abstract were the best that the Republicans could do just then.

But hilarity and rejoicing over past election triumphs did not mean that the Republicans would win next time. Nor were generalizations about Union and equality concrete issues upon which a campaign could be made. Something tangible was needed. As to the Union, the Democrats declared for it as loudly as the Republicans. Indeed, their principal charge against the new party was that the Republicans were the real disunionists; and pleas for the equality of all men, negroes and whites alike, would lose more votes than such appeals gained — a fact which Lincoln was to face in his fight with Douglas for the Senate, eighteen months later.

In spite of its recent triumphs at the polls throughout the North, the new party was now in a bad way. Republican speakers and press had nothing to talk about. Kansas had

[1] *Chicago Democratic Press*, Dec. 11, 1856.

ceased to bleed, and most people were tired of that gory subject; no party issue could be made out of our foreign affairs, which were vexed and threatening; the repeal of the Missouri Compromise had been worn threadbare, and nobody proposed to restore that old adjustment — Lincoln least of all; the new party was not united even for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, and Lincoln stood firmly for that statute — we shall presently hear him making strong protest against so much as the mention of it in party conventions or platforms; the financial and industrial crash so soon to overwhelm the nation was not yet sensed, and, in spite of increasing hard times, even bankers and business men appear not to have realized the impending economic disaster.

In the North only the Abolitionists had a real issue — the destruction of slavery everywhere and at once. But from no proposal did Republican leaders flee in greater alarm than from that.

Worse still, early in the new year, an event took place which embarrassed the Republicans. They had been thunderously denouncing the fire-eaters of the South for preaching disunion — 'we won't go out and you shan't,' Lincoln had said — and now Northern fire-eaters were demanding the same thing in terms as fierce as Southern extremists ever had uttered. These disunionists of the North were the Abolitionists, allies of the Republican Party. Indeed, the Democrats and the whole South charged and believed that Abolitionists and Republicans were affiliated, if not identical,[1] and it is certain that most Abolitionists and the vast number whom they influenced had voted for Frémont.

On January 15, 1857, the disunionists of Massachusetts met at Worcester. Disunion speeches were made, disunion resolutions adopted. 'The sooner the separation takes place, the more peaceful it will be: but that peace or war is a *secondary consideration*,' ran one resolution. 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS,' cried Garrison at the end of a long, able, and pas-

[1] *Washington Union*, May 14, 1857. 'Their principles and objects are the same.' Garrison, however, could not endorse Frémont, because Frémont believed in 'the Union as it is,' and he advised those who agreed with him not to vote for him.

sionate speech.[1] Wendell Phillips said that the Union was 'accursed of God' — away with it — 'the whole South is one great magazine of cowards.' The Reverend Samuel J. May, Jr., wanted New England to secede by itself if the rest of the North would not — let Massachusetts go out alone if need be.[2]

'Talk of treason!' exclaimed Rev. Thomas Wentworth Higginson: 'Why, I have been trying for ten years to get the opportunity to commit treason' — disunion was 'destiny,' he shouted. Frank W. Bird of Walpole, Mass., announced that 'the decision of the Supreme Court, in the Scott case is soon to be given, affirming the extreme Southern doctrine, that slavery goes everywhere under the Federal flag' — let the North withdraw.[3] At night Phillips spoke again. There was no reason for the Union, he said; we are 'essentially two nations. . . . Treason! . . . Treason runs in the blood that flowed out on Bunker Hill.'[4] The hall rocked with approving cheers.

Theodore Parker could not attend the Convention, but wrote that it was a good thing — it would teach manners to the South, that 'shrew' to whom the North was wedded, 'thriftless, idle, drunken, dirty, lewd, shrill-voiced, . . . feeble bodied, and ugly to look upon.' But Parker was not for breaking up the Union — at least not 'just now,' because 'the North is seventeen millions strong; and the South contains eleven millions, whereof four millions are slaves, and four millions "poor whites."' Parker once thought the slavery question could be settled without bloodshed, he wrote; but he now realized that it would require war.[5]

In such fashion raged the secessionists of the North. For nearly twenty years the disunion sentiment had been growing throughout that section; and after the election of Buchanan disunion meetings and conventions had been held in many towns in the free States.[6] At anti-slavery conventions at

[1] *Liberator*, Jan. 23, 1857.

[2] *Ib.*, Jan. 30, 1857.

[3] *Ib.*, Feb. 6, 1857.

[4] *Ib.*, Feb. 20, 1857.

[5] Parker to Higginson, Jan. 18, 1857, *ib.*, Jan. 23, 1857. Also *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker:* John Weiss, II, 192–4.

[6] Henry C. Wright to Garrison, Toledo, Ohio, Dec. 20, 1856, *Liberator*, Jan. 16, 1857. Wright makes mention of such 'conventions' at Angola, Ind., and Adrian, Mich., and speaks of other 'Conventions which I have attended the past five years.' All anti-slavery assemblages declared for secession by the North.

Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, and Albany during February, 1857, violent secession speeches were made.[1] Disunion 'tracts' were circulated widely.[2] At the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in Boston, January 29–30, 1857, Parker Pillsbury not only denounced 'this guilty Union,' but 'spoke with much power of the right of the slaves to rise in insurrection against their tyrants and enslavers.'[3]

Republican leaders were asked to attend the Worcester meeting. Senator Wilson flatly denounced the project; Giddings was sympathetic, but thought that 'we should remain in the Union' and trust to the Republican Party to extend liberty;[4] Seward wrote a letter of dissent, but did not send it.[5] Most Republicans who received invitations ignored them.

Here was a predicament for the Republican managers. They could not offend the overwhelming Union sentiment of their party and of the North by even countenancing the Northern disunionists; nor could they harshly rebuke the Abolitionists, since they were now 'recruiting officers for the Republicans' and 'their active hostility was yearly becoming more dangerous.'[6] So, for the most part, Republican speakers and newspapers said nothing about the inflammatory conventions at Worcester and other places. Lincoln, too, was silent; he attacked only the disunionists of the South; they alone were dangerous; Northern secessionists would be strong Union men when the fatal day should dawn, since it would then be the South and not they who seceded; by no possibility could they induce any free State to withdraw from the Union. So let them talk all they liked.

Even Greeley's sharp and burning pen was dull and cold. The *Tribune* merely reported the proceedings of the Worcester convention, praising the speakers — 'master archers' — but remarking that '"eloquence was dog cheap" at the Revolu-

For brief but dramatic account of the Massachusetts Disunion Convention see Channing, VI, 180–5. Professor Channing is the first scholar to give an account of the disunion movement in the North.

[1] *Liberator*, March 6, 1857. [2] *Washington Union*, March 20, 1857.

[3] *Liberator*, Feb. 6, 1857.

[4] Wilson to Higginson, Jan. 10; Giddings to same, Jan. 7, 1857, *Liberator*, Jan. 23, 1857.

[5] *Life of William Henry Seward:* Frederic Bancroft, I, 435–6. [6] *Ib.*, 436.

tionary Convention. . . . Common sense was uncommonly uncommon. Time alone can determine whether common or *uncommon* sense is the truest wisdom.' [1] But Greeley was in a tighter place than most Republican editors. Less than eight months before, the *Tribune* had published, seemingly with approval, the statement of its Washington correspondent, James S. Pike, the most radical and pugnacious journalist in the capital, if not in the country: 'Personally, I have no doubt that the Free and Slave States ought to separate.' [2] Such expressions of opinion were given now and then by country Republican editors. 'This twaddle about the "Union" and its preservation, is too silly and sickening for any good effect. *We think the liberty of a single slave is worth more than* ALL THE UNIONS GOD'S UNIVERSE CAN HOLD!' [3]

In general, such views seldom appeared in the Republican press and never were uttered by Republican speakers. When the call for the Worcester gathering was sent out, the ably edited *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican* merely remarked that the project was 'simply boyish and contemptible' — let the promoters of secession go South for signers; [4] and this was the common feeling among Republicans.

Still the incident was vexatious, and made the leaders and newspapers of the new party keener than ever for something practical to talk about, something of which an issue could be made, something that would even silently influence voters, something that would split and weaken the united and strong Democratic Party. All these things speedily came, came successively and, as if timed by Fate, came with cumulative force. Seldom if ever has a political party been so favored by fortune as were the Republicans during 1857. The first piece of good luck they had was the Dred Scott decision; the second, a book of fury and fact called *The Impending Crisis* by a young native

[1] Worcester Correspondence, 'J. R.,' New York *Tribune*, Jan. 17, in issue Jan. 19, 1857; 2nd dispatch, Jan. 14 in issue of Jan. 21, 1857.

[2] Washington Correspondence, New York *Tribune*, June 3, in issue June 5, 1856.

[3] *True American* (Rep.), Erie Co., Pa., as quoted in *Illinois State Register*, Aug. 12, 1856. Italics and capitals *Register's*.

[4] Jan. 6, 1857, editorial. The *Republican's* report of the Convention, although full and accurate, was contemptuous.

of North Carolina; the third, the Mormon resistance to the National Government; the fourth, a ruinous financial panic; the fifth, Douglas's defiance of the Administration and the split of the Democratic Party over a Constitution for Kansas.

Just at the time when Lincoln, as the candidate of both Democrats and Whigs for the Legislature in 1834, was going from cabin to cabin among the woods along the water courses and in the groves of Sangamon County in search of votes, a young surgeon of the United States Army, Dr. John Emerson, was making his way from St. Louis to the frontier military station at Rock Island, Illinois, to which he had been transferred. With Dr. Emerson went a body servant, a young negro of perhaps thirty years, whom he had bought of Peter Blow, an important business man of St. Louis.

The name of the slave was Dred Scott. He had been born on the Blow plantation in Virginia sometime during the presidency of Jefferson.

After two years at Rock Island, Dr. Emerson was ordered to Fort Snelling, an outpost in that part of the Territory of Wisconsin which is now the State of Minnesota; and the surgeon took his servant with him. At this station lived the Agent for Indian Affairs with the Northwestern tribes, Major Laurence Taliaferro.[1] This official owned a negro girl, Harriet. Emerson bought her, probably for a maid to his wife. The surgeon stayed at Fort Snelling until October, 1837. In due time Dred married Harriet with the consent of their owner. Not long afterward Dr. Emerson was transferred back to St. Louis, and Dred and his wife went with him.

On the Mississippi River steamboat, *Gypsy*, before it reached the Missouri line, Harriet gave birth to a girl; and, after a year in St. Louis, another girl was born. In 1842 Dr. Emerson left the Army,[2] because of ill-health. The Dred Scott family continued as his slaves. Two years later Dr. Emerson died, and the negroes became the property of his wife, who was made administratrix of her husband's estate.

[1] Taliaferro's testimony before retiring board, Aug., 1863. MSS. War Department, Washington, D.C.

[2] Records War Dept.

In the fall of 1846, eight years after his return to Missouri, Dred Scott brought suit for his liberty against Mrs. Emerson in the State Court at St. Louis. The ground of the suit was that by living in Illinois he had been made free under the Constitution of that State, and that his sojourn in the Territory of Wisconsin had also made him free, because the Missouri Compromise of 1820 prohibited slavery in the domain acquired from France north of the line of 36° and 30′, except the State of Missouri. In the trial court Dred won; but Mrs. Emerson appealed to the State Supreme Court which reversed the judgment on the ground that, having returned to Missouri voluntarily, the negro resumed his status of slavery under the laws of that State. In so deciding, the majority of the Missouri Supreme Court frankly overruled previous decisions in like cases, and the Chief Justice, Hamilton R. Gamble, dissented in a stern opinion.[1]

This decision was made at the March term of the Supreme Court of Missouri, 1852.

At this point, politics comes upon the stage. In 1850, while the appeal was pending in the State Supreme Court, Mrs. Emerson married Dr. Calvin Clifford Chaffee, of Springfield, Massachusetts. Chaffee, then thirty-nine years old, was elected a Representative in the Thirty-fourth Congress and continued a Representative throughout the Dred Scott litigation. He was a Know-Nothing and an Abolitionist.

[1] Scott (a man of color) *vs.* Emerson, Mo. Sup. Ct. Rept., xv, 577–92.

The spirit of the majority opinion is shown by such passages as: 'Times now are not as they were when the former decisions on this subject were made. Since then, not only individuals but States have been possessed with a dark and vile spirit in relation to slavery . . . whose inevitable consequence must be the overthrow and destruction of our government. Under such circumstances, it does not behoove the State of Missouri to show the least countenance to any measure which might gratify that spirit. . . .

'On almost three sides, the State of Missouri is surrounded by free soil. . . . Considering the numberless instances in which those living along an extreme frontier would have occasion to occupy their slaves beyond our boundary, how hard would it be if our courts should liberate all the slaves who should be thus employed. How unreasonable to ask it! If a master sends his slave to hunt his horses or cattle beyond the boundary, shall he thereby be liberated? But our courts, it is said, will not go so far. If not go the entire length, why go at all? . . .

'There is no comparison between the slave in the United States and the cruel uncivilized negro in Africa. When the condition of our slaves is contrasted with the state of their miserable race in Africa . . . we are almost persuaded, that the introduction of slavery amongst us was, in the providence of God . . . a means of placing that unhappy race within the pale of civilized nations.'

Mrs. Chaffee and her husband could have disposed of their interest in the slaves at any time, and they did so very soon after the Supreme Court of the United States decided the Dred Scott case. For the time being, however, the negro family was, ostensibly, kept in bondage, and was so continued until that historic litigation came to an end.

The former Mrs. Emerson, now Mrs. Chaffee, had a brother, John F. A. Sanford, who lived in New York; and a 'fictitious sale' of the Scott negroes was made to him.[1] This was done so that a suit could be brought by Dred in the United States District Court at St. Louis against Sanford in New York, on the ground that the plaintiff and the defendant lived in different States. Otherwise the United States Court would not have jurisdiction to hear and decide it. To have brought the suit against Mrs. Chaffee would have exposed the fact that the wife of an abolitionist member of Congress from Massachusetts was the owner of slaves. Worse still, it also would have shown what kind of a case it was. So, on November 2, 1853, an attorney of St. Louis, Roswell M. Field, brought suit for Dred Scott against Sanford in the Federal Court at St. Louis, praying that he and his family be given their freedom.

For the fictitious defendant, Sanford, appeared an anti-slavery lawyer of the name of Hugh A. Garland. Sanford went to St. Louis and on the day Field filed Dred's suit against him accepted service of the summons. Sanford filed a plea in abatement to the jurisdiction of the court, denying that Dred Scott was a citizen of Missouri 'because he is a negro of African descent; his ancestors were of pure African blood, and were brought into this country and sold as negro slaves,' and therefore, that the Court did not have jurisdiction. To this plea, Field, for Dred Scott, promptly filed a demurrer[2] — that is,

[1] *The Supreme Court in United States History:* Charles Warren, II, 281. Mr. Warren's account of the Dred Scott case is full, detailed, accurate, and distinguished for impartiality, fairness, and courage. Unless specifically indicated in footnote references, the narrative in the text follows that of Mr. Warren.

For a brilliant and reliable account of the Dred Scott case, see Channing, VI, 186–97. Practically all treatments of this subject that appeared before those of Professor Channing, Mr. Warren, and one by Bernard Steiner, hereafter to be noted, are so erroneous as to facts and so deeply prejudiced, that they are historically of little value.

[2] April 14, 1854.

that the facts stated by Sanford did not show that Dred was not a citizen, and therefore, that the Court did have jurisdiction.

On this demurrer, Robert W. Wells, the United States District Judge, decided for Scott. Immediately, the attorneys arranged with the Court 'that an agreed case should be made up by them.' This was done, pleas filed, issues joined, and the case tried on an agreed statement of facts, which were those given in this narrative. On this statement Judge Wells refused to instruct the jury that the law was with Dred Scott as formally requested by his attorney, Field; and, instead, instructed the jury that the law was with Sanford, as formally requested by his attorney, Garland. Since this instruction was the reverse of the Court's ruling for Scott on the demurrer, it is obvious that from the first the whole case was arranged for appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it was promptly taken on a writ of error. Here another thread becomes a part of this web of mystery — Dred Scott's appeal bond was signed by Henry Taylor Blow,[1] a son of Peter Blow, from whom Dred Scott had been bought by Dr. Emerson.

On May 25, 1854, nearly six months after Field brought the suit and just when the storm over the Kansas-Nebraska Act was raging furiously, he wrote to Montgomery Blair in Washington that it would be better for the country to have the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise decided one way or the other, even adversely, than to have the question left open.[2] And again, just after the case reached the Supreme Court in December, 1854, Field wrote Blair that if he would 'bring it to a hearing and decision, . . . a much disputed question would be settled by the highest Court of the Nation.[3]

Six months before the case was even entered on the docket of that tribunal,[4] a pamphlet, containing a certified transcript of the whole proceedings in the District Court, was printed at St. Louis, July 1, 1854, and circulated. This pamphlet, entitled *The Case of Dred Scott in the Supreme Court of the United States, December Term*, 1854, contained a preface, dated July 4, 1854,

[1] *Life of Roger Brooke Taney:* Bernard Steiner, 331. [2] *Ib.*
[3] Steiner, 331. [4] Dec. 30, 1854. Records, Clerk Supreme Court.

signed by the mark of Dred Scott. It was an appeal to all who might read it for sympathy and help.

Whoever wrote this preface was an adroit politician and a master of the art of propaganda. It was addressed 'To my Fellow-Men,' and briefly and clearly stated the facts in paragraphs of from one to three sentences only. Then, making Scott talk in the first person, it went on to say, that, at the trial, the Judge, in Scott's presence, read from the Illinois Constitution of 1818 and the Missouri Compromise, and Dred was made to continue his simple and affecting story thus:

'The Judge said that, according to these laws, while I was in Illinois and Wisconsin, I was a free man — just as good as my master — and that I had as much right to make a slave of a white man, as a white man to make a slave of me.

'I was sorry nobody ever told me that while I was there. Yet I was glad to hear the judge talk so, for I thought he would set me free.

'But, after a little while the judge said that as soon as my master got me back this side of the line of Missouri, my right to be free was gone; and that I and my wife and my children became nothing but so many pieces of property.

'I thought it hard that white men should draw a line of their own on the face of the earth, on one side of which a black man was to become no man at all, and never say a word to the black man about it until they had got him on that side of the line. So I appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

'My case will be heard at the next term beginning in December.

'I am now in the hands of the sheriff of this county, who hires me out and receives my wages. I am not at liberty to go out of the county. I have no money to pay any body at Washington to speak for me.

'My fellow-men, can any of you help me in my day of trial? Will nobody speak for me at Washington, even without hope of other reward than the blessings of a poor black man and his family? I do not know. I can only pray that some good heart will be moved by pity to do that for me which I can not do for

myself; and that if the right is on my side, it may be so declared by the high court to which I have appealed.'

It would appear to be certain, that payment for the printing and distribution of this circular was made by the same person or interest that bore the expense of the whole litigation; but who that person or interest was, is not positively known. It is clear only that the outlay was made in the anti-slavery cause.

So when the Supreme Court of the United States convened in December, 1854, it found on the docket the case of Scott *vs.* Sanford. It took its regular course, and was not reached for argument until February 11, 1856. At the request of Field, Montgomery Blair appeared for Dred Scott. Because of the public controversy over the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Blair afterward declared that he tried to get 'one of the ablest men at the Bar in the South' to help him, and nearly succeeded; but that the eminent Southern lawyer finally declined though not 'from the selfish motive given in the press.' Then Blair sought the help of Northern lawyers, he said; but they too, refused, some because of previous engagements and others because Blair's request came too late for them to prepare arguments.[1]

Henry S. Geyer, then Senator from Missouri, an eminent lawyer in that State, and Reverdy Johnson of Maryland, of fine abilities, an old line Whig of the stern and rock-bound type and an intense believer in slavery, appeared for Sanford. Both men came into the case voluntarily, Johnson, as he tells us, mainly because of his long-held convictions that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional.

Immediately after the argument, the New York *Tribune* printed dispatches from its Washington correspondent, that the case would probably be decided against Scott on 'the pretext' that his voluntary return to Missouri restored his status of slavery; that the Supreme Court might 'evade' the real issue and thus possibly prevent the delivery of dissenting opinions on the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise, but that 'an effort will be made to get a positive decree of some sort, and,

[1] Blair's statement in *National Intelligencer*, Dec. 24, 1856, as quoted in Warren, II, 282.

in that event, there is some hope of aid from the Southern members of the Court.' [1]

During April, 1856, the Court held two consultations on the Dred Scott case. The *Tribune's* correspondent was puzzled as to how the Court stood, but said that 'there was hope that the decree might be made upon the merits.' Washington representatives of other papers were no less perplexed; but it was positively asserted that if the majority should decide against Scott on any ground, Justice McLean of Ohio would 'confound' them in a dissenting opinion and Justice Curtis of Massachusetts would give a 'powerful exposition of the case and of all the incidental questions connected with it.' [2] Such was the judgment of newspaper men on the ground during April, 1856, a vital fact and a vital date in view of what followed.

But Justice Curtis wrote to George Ticknor of Boston, who was then in Italy, that the Court had determined that it would 'not decide the question of the Missouri Compromise line — a majority of the judges being of opinion that it is not necessary to do so. (This is confidential.)' [3]

At this time the Court stood four to four on the question of jurisdiction, with Justice Nelson of New York undecided on that point. So grave was his doubt, that he asked his associates to order a reargument and this was done May 12, 1856, the reargument to be heard at the beginning of the next session of the Court in December. General opinion was that, in view of the tempestuous Presidential campaign then at hand, 'the Court had acted wisely in not giving a decision on this delicate question prior to the election.' But Greeley, bitterly disappointed, assailed the Justices with his usual intemperance of language — 'the black gowns have come to be artful dodgers.' [4]

John McLean of Ohio was the one Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States who has ever taken an active part

[1] Quoted in Warren, II, 283. These surmises of the correspondent as to the Court's probable action were surprisingly in accord with the facts. *Ib.*

[2] *Ib.*, 283–4.

[3] Justice B. R. Curtis to George Ticknor, April 8, 1856. *Memoir of Benjamin Robbins Curtis*, edited by his son, B. R. Curtis, I, 179–80.

[4] Warren, II, 285.

in politics while on the bench.[1] Even before his appointment as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court by Jackson in 1829, McLean had been either an active or 'receptive' candidate for the Presidency; votes had been cast for him in the Whig Convention in 1848; and at critical times he had written for publication his views on burning questions, some of which might come before the Supreme Court for decision. For this unjudicial conduct Justice McLean had been criticized with utmost severity, both in Congress and in the press.[2]

And now again, when the Republican Convention of 1856 was approaching, and when the validity of the Missouri Compromise was before the Court in the Dred Scott case, or at least when newspaper men in Washington knew that Justice McLean was ready with a dissenting opinion asserting the power of Congress to exclude slavery from the Territories, he once more made public, and in vigorous language, his views on that subject.[3]

It was because of this statement of Justice McLean and of the eagerness and expectation of the Republican press and leaders that the Supreme Court would pass upon the Missouri Compromise in its decision of the Dred Scott case, that Lincoln

[1] Warren, II, 269–71. [2] *Ib.*, 270–1.

[3] In a long and thoroughly political letter — the letter of a candidate — written from Cincinnati eleven days before the Philadelphia Convention, June 17, 1856, McLean tells a political supporter that the Dred Scott case has been continued until the December term; while he could say nothing about it, he was glad that his friend liked 'my views already publicly avowed as to the constitutional power of the general government over the subject of slavery in the territories.' McLean to Alexander C. M. Pennington, June 6, 1856. McLean MSS.

McLean was criticized in the House by James A. Stewart of Maryland: 'In exciting times like these, when all earthly tribunals, in order to command respect, must be firm, unswerving, and above raving, popular clamor; when, too, the merits of the question were much involved in a case to come before him as one of the Judges of the last resort — to have made a parade of his opinion, thus intermingling with the partisan debates of a passing hour — cannot certainly commend himself to the approval of an intelligent public.' *Cong. Globe*, 34th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, 985.

Justice McLean received many flattering letters, some of them predicting that he would be nominated instead of Frémont. J. Watson Webb (editor *New York Courier*, a radical Republican paper) to McLean, June 2, 1856; E. B. Washburne (writing from Hall of House of Representatives) to McLean, June 10, 1856, asking for data as to McLean's life to use in case he is nominated at Philadelphia. McLean MSS.

In fact these letters began in 1855. When Frémont was chosen as the Republican candidate it was reported that McLean would vote for Fillmore because the Republican party was sectional. Many letters of inquiry were written him, but the old Justice would neither affirm nor deny the truth of the report.

had said in the Frémont campaign that that tribunal was the one to settle such questions, that when it did so, the Republicans would abide by what the Court held to be the law and Lincoln had challenged the Democrats to do the same. If they would not, 'who are the disunionists, you or we?'

Such was the situation when the Supreme Court convened in December, 1856, and the day set for the second argument of Scott *vs.* Sanford, the 15th of that month, arrived. On that date, Stephens, who had made sharp reference to the Dred Scott case in his speech on Kansas in the House on June 28, 1856, and who was now as fearful as Greeley formerly had been that the court would ignore the question of the Missouri Compromise, wrote to his brother:

'I have been urging all the influences I could bring to bear upon the Supreme Court to get them to postpone no longer the case on the Missouri Restriction before them, but to decide it. They take it up to-day. If they decide, as I have reason to believe they will, that the restriction was unconstitutional, that Congress had no power to pass it, then the question — the political question — as I think, will be ended as to the power of the people in their Territorial Legislatures. It will be, in effect, a *res adjudicata*.' [1]

On the other hand, radical Republican papers like the *New York Courier* and the New York *Tribune* had now become alarmed lest the Court would pass upon the Missouri Compromise, and they deplored such a decision by 'political judges' — it would seriously impair the reputation of the Court, they feared.[2]

Again Senator Geyer and Reverdy Johnson appeared for Sanford, and again Montgomery Blair made an argument for Dred Scott; but this time he had induced one of the foremost lawyers in the country to assist him. George Ticknor Curtis of Massachusetts, the brother of Justice Curtis of the Supreme Court,

[1] Stephens to Linton Stephens, Dec. 15, 1856. *Life of Alexander H. Stephens:* Johnston and Browne, 316. The idea that a decision against the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise would put an end to the old and acrimonious political controversy about it and give quiet to the country, was the very point that Wayne soon urged upon Taney.

[2] Warren, II, 286–9.

was then in Washington on other business, and only three days before the hearing, he agreed to argue the question of the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise.[1] To that one question, therefore, his great address was confined.

When the argument began, the court room was crowded. Eminent lawyers, Senators, members of the House, and many women listened to that notable contest. Johnson's speech was one of the 'finest efforts made at the Bar,' wrote an unfriendly hearer; and another, who was positively hostile, acknowledged that it 'was brilliant, eloquent and witty;' but, he added, it was more like a stump speech than such an argument ought to be.[2]

The answer of Curtis was an intellectual feat. The Court had nothing to do with the political aspect of the question, he began — whether and in what manner the power of Congress should be exercised — but only with the existence of that power. Curtis's frankness was amazing. If he held in his hand the legislative power of Congress over slavery in the Territories, he would use or withhold that power as circumstances dictated, he declared: 'I would prohibit the relation of master and slave, or permit or sanction it, according to the nature of the soil and climate, the character of the present or the probable character of the future settlers.'

But that was not the question before the Court, he said; the only point to be decided, was 'purely juridical' — did Congress have power over slavery in the Territories? 'As a jurist I believe that Congress has full power to prohibit the introduction of slavery into the Territories of the United States; as a citizen, I can conceive of cases in which it would be unjust to a portion of the Union to exercise that power, and in which I would never exercise it.'

The great Massachusetts lawyer then made an argument which was a historical and logical demonstration of the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories.[3] Toward the end of his address, however, Curtis again went out of his way to say that, while

[1] Curtis's *Memoir*, I, 240–1.

[2] Washington Correspondence, *New York Courier* and New York *Tribune*, as quoted in Warren, II, 288.

[3] The argument for the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise was based on Art. IV, Sect. 3, of the Constitution: 'The Congress shall have power to . . . make all

Congress had that power, as a matter of law, Congress ought not to have tried to dictate what the Constitution of Missouri should contain; and Curtis further asserted that, if circumstance required it, he himself would vote for the admission of a slave State. He closed by saying that he had come into the case 'solely from an impulse of duty,' because Blair had failed 'to obtain assistance in the interest of his case.' [1]

Everybody praised Curtis's speech. 'He was congratulated warmly and by several Southern Senators,' reported the *National Intelligencer*. Justice Catron (of Tennessee) told Curtis's brother, Justice Curtis, that 'it was the best argument on a question of constitutional law he had heard in the court — and he has been here since General Jackson's time;' and, with pride in his brother's triumph, the Justice from Massachusetts wrote to Ticknor, that 'George' had won laurels for himself and the bar of New England.[2]

The spirits of the radicals rose. Perhaps, after all, the Court would not 'dodge' the question, but would decide that the Missouri Compromise was constitutional, as they so much wanted and had once expected the Court to do — perhaps the day had been saved for them by Curtis, stern foe though he was of the whole Republican movement, that 'sectional party,' as he scornfully called it.

In the House defiant warning was sounded that if the Supreme Court should decide that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional, it might thereby 'destroy' itself. A Court composed mostly of Justices from Southern Districts, far inferior in population, wealth, and business to Districts in the North, would not be respected or obeyed by the people of the Free States, exclaimed Benjamin Stanton of Ohio, a Republican leader; certainly there was precedent for ignoring such a deci-

needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States.'

[1] Curtis's argument, preceded by an admirable statement of the case, was printed in pamphlet form in Boston, 1857. This was done on the request of Crittenden of Kentucky, Badger of North Carolina, and other Southern men. 'Some of the ablest minds in the South, at that time, did not regard it as supremely important to their sectional interests to have it judicially proclaimed that the Missouri Compromise restriction was unconstitutional.' Curtis's *Memoir*, I, 241.

[2] Curtis to Ticknor, Feb. 27, 1857. *Ticknor:* Curtis, I, 192–4.

sion, he said. The Supreme Court ought not to pass upon 'great political questions.' Stanton asserted the doctrine of the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, that when any law is a 'plain, palpable, and deliberate violation of the Constitution,' the States have a right to disregard it and refuse obedience to it. As we shall presently see, this extreme theory of States' Rights had now been adopted, for the time being, as a prime article of the Republican creed.[1]

General opinion during January, 1857, was that the Court would not evade the main question and would hold the Missouri Compromise to be unconstitutional. Let it come now while the North was wrought up, wrote the belligerent Pike to the *Tribune;* that would show that Court, Congress, and President were 'confederates' for the extension of slavery. Yes, by all means, let us have it, 'distinctly, and now.' [2] Stephens wrote to his brother that he had heard, '*sub rosa*,' that this would be the outcome. But whatever the decision might be, said Stephens, it would have a tremendous 'political effect' and would be 'a marked epoch in our history.' [3] Probably Justice Wayne had told his fellow Georgian what he thought the decision would be.

But, at a long consultation on February 15, 1857, the Court determined to ignore the Missouri Compromise entirely, and to decide against Dred Scott on the sole ground that under the laws of Missouri, as expounded by its Supreme Court, Scott's return to that State had restored his status of slavery and therefore that he could bring no suit in the United States Court; and Justice Samuel Nelson of New York was directed to write the Court's opinion to that effect.

At this point an incident changed conditions. A few days after the Court had thus settled what it would do, it was found

[1] *Cong. Globe*, 34th Cong. 3rd Sess., 300–1, Jan. 12, 1857. Stanton's speech was made in support of a resolution, which the House immediately passed, for the reorganization of the Federal Judiciary so as 'to equalize the population and business of the several circuits and districts, and give to all sections of the Confederacy their equal and just representation in the Supreme Court of the United States.'

The disproportion was very great. For instance, the 7th Circuit (Ohio, Ill., Ind., and Mich.) had nine times more people than the 9th Circuit (Miss. and Ark.); the 2nd Circuit (Vt., Conn., and N.Y.) had nearly six times more than the 5th Circuit (Ala. and La.), etc.

[2] Jan. 5, 1857, as quoted in Warren, II, 292.

[3] Stephens to Linton Stephens, Jan. 1, 1857. Johnston and Browne, 313.

that Justices McLean and Curtis had not relinquished their purpose to give extended dissenting opinions in emphatic support of the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise. Here was, indeed, a mare's-nest! If the majority ignored that question and two Justices from the North dealt with it boldly and at length, the country would say that the majority had dodged the real issue and decided on a mere technicality. Yet the Chief Justice, Justice Grier of Pennsylvania, and all the Southern Justices, believed as honestly and firmly that Congress had no right to pass the Missouri Compromise, as McLean and Curtis believed the contrary, and the record did make possible the decision of that question. The Court could contrive to avoid it, but also could legitimately meet it if it must be met.

So the stand of McLean and Curtis 'forced the majority . . . to reconsider the necessity of discussing that point as well, themselves.' [1]

The inauguration of Buchanan was now at hand, and the decision of the Dred Scott case was overdue — it could be delayed no longer. Perhaps the situation was good after all — might not the uproar over slavery in the Territories be stopped and quiet restored to the country by a firm, clear pronouncement from the Supreme Court of the United States, that the Missouri Compromise was null and void? Many conservative men thought that it would.[2]

So, too, thought Justice Wayne of Georgia; and 'with the best intentions, with entirely patriotic motives, and believing thoroughly that such was the law,' testifies George Ticknor Curtis,[3] Justice Wayne moved that the assignment to Justice Nelson to write the opinion of the Court as stated be withdrawn and that the Chief Justice should give the views of the Court 'covering all the points involved,' [4] and this was done. But Wayne had not talked to the other Justices before he made his proposal to the full Court in conference.[5]

[1] Warren, II, 293.

[2] *John Archibald Campbell:* Henry G. Connor (Judge U.S. Court, East. Dist. N.C.), 65–6.

[3] Curtis's *Memoir*, I, 206. [4] Warren, II, 294.

[5] For an account, written fourteen years later, of what was done in conference during the Court's deliberations on the Dred Scott Case, see former Justice Campbell to Samuel Tyler, Nov. 24, 1870, and Justice Nelson to same, May 13, 1871, in *Memoir of Roger Brooke Taney:* Samuel Tyler, 382–5.

Justice Grier of Pennsylvania, however, did not want to pass upon the Missouri Compromise, although he 'had somehow become convinced that it would be useful to the country for him to agree with the Chief Justice, that Congress could not prohibit the existence of slavery in a Territory.' [1] So two weeks before the inauguration, Justice Catron, a close friend of Buchanan, wrote to him to 'drop Grier a line, saying how necessary it is, and how good the opportunity is, to settle the agitation by an affirmative decision of the Supreme Court, the one way or the other.' Relying on their intimate personal relations, Catron also suggested what Buchanan might 'safely say' in his inaugural about the Dred Scott case — the Supreme Court '*must*' decide the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise at some time or other, it was now before that tribunal, the 'high and independent character' of the Court was a guarantee that it would properly 'decide and settle a controversy which has so long and seriously agitated the country.'

Justice Catron also added this vital testimony: '*A majority of my Brethren will be forced up to this point by two dissentients.*' [2]

If there was one thing more than another that the President-elect wanted, it was to get this source of conflict out of the way, to extinguish the whole slavery agitation, to give the country peace and rest.[3] The old man wished to begin and continue his Administration in quiet. He had been out of party politics for a time, and had, in a measure, forgotten the methods of politicians. In short, Buchanan was in the same case, in that regard, as every member of the Supreme Court, except McLean.

Like all of them, too, except McLean, Nelson, and Curtis, the President-elect also believed that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional, and that if the Supreme Court should say so, the entire controversy would be brought to an end. Had not Congress repealed it? Had not President Pierce denounced it as void? Had not the people so declared in electing Bu-

[1] Curtis's *Memoir*, 209.

[2] Catron to Buchanan, Feb. 19, 1857. *Buchanan's Works:* Moore, x, 106 *n.* Italics author's.

[3] Buchanan's election and the Dred Scott decision 'will secure to the country that repose and quiet for which Mr. Buchanan so ardently hopes.' *Washington Daily Union*, March 6, 1857, editorial.

chanan? Now if the highest judicial body in the Nation or in the world should say the same thing, surely the mouth of clamor would be shut.

As requested, Buchanan wrote to his life-long friend, Justice Grier. In view of the accusations so soon to be made and the furious abuse so soon to be rained upon President and Court, it is fortunate that Grier made answer; for this intimate private letter tells just what had taken place in the Court and what would be done. Writing only a few days before the Presidential oath was to be administered, Justice Grier said that the Dred Scott case had not been taken up in conference 'till lately,' because one of the Justices had been ill and absent.[1]

When they did meet at last, there was much discussion, Grier related; but finally the majority agreed that, on the pleadings, the case could be decided by merely affirming the judgment of the District Court, without passing upon the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise or 'the right of a negro to sue in the courts of the United States.' Nelson had been directed to write the opinion accordingly, 'leaving those difficult questions untouched.'

But, confided Justice Grier to the President-elect, McLean and Curtis — especially Justice McLean — were 'determined to come out with a long and labored dissent' on the whole case 'including their opinions and arguments on both the troublesome points, although not necessary to a decision of the case.' The majority of the Court thought that both questions were '*in* the case and may be legitimately considered,' but had hoped to avoid them.

In this situation, Justice Grier continued, the majority felt compelled to give their views also, but, at that time, he and Nelson would not commit themselves. Since the question was thus forced upon them, Grier had made up his mind to join the majority, so that 'it should not appear that the line of latitude should mark the line of division in the court.' While the Southern Justices agreed in their conclusion, they did so for different reasons; and therefore, said Grier, he would 'concur' with the Chief Justice and try to get 'brothers Daniel and Campbell and

[1] Justice Wayne.

Catron' to do the same thing, so as to avoid 'clashing and inconsistent arguments.'

Still Grier was fearful. The aggressive action of McLean and Curtis had fired the blood of the Justices from the South. 'I fear some rather extreme views may be thrown out by some of our southern brethren,' the Pennsylvania Justice warned Buchanan. However that might turn out, 'six, if not *seven*' Justices would hold the Missouri Compromise to be of no effect; 'but the opinions will not be delivered before Friday the 6th of March. We will not let any others of our Brethren know any thing about *the cause of our anxiety* to produce this result, and though contrary to our usual practice, we have thought it due to you to state to you in candor and confidence the real state of the matter.' [1]

In this wise, it came about that Chief Justice Taney took up the task of writing his celebrated opinion in the Dred Scott case, an opinion with which party rancor and party necessity were to befoul his great reputation for well-nigh half a century. The preparation of that historic paper was for Taney a tremendous undertaking. He was very old and very feeble; he had scarcely more than two weeks in which to do the work; and during that short time he must preside over the Court every day and attend to the other business before it. Aged and weak as he was, his fine mind was as strong and clear as ever, and his convictions on the racial and constitutional questions involved were firm, positive, almost passionate.

On March 4, 1857, the sun rose over flag-bedecked Washington. The usual throngs crowded the hotels, filled the streets, and finally went to the Capitol to witness the inaugural ceremonies. Down Pennsylvania Avenue came the procession, the handsome and still youthful-looking President sitting beside his gray-haired and dignified successor. When the platform at the Capitol was reached, the President and the President-elect took seats for a moment beside the waiting Chief Justice, and polite and casual words were spoken. Unhappy circumstance! That incident was to be made use of with remorseless purpose and dramatic effect as evidence of the charges of conspiracy,

[1] Grier to Buchanan, Feb. 23, 1857. Moore, x, 106–8 *n*. Italics Grier's.

so soon to be flung in the faces of the Nation's Chief Magistrate and the head of the Nation's Judiciary.

When Buchanan rose, relates an unfriendly press correspondent who was there, 'dressed with his habitual precision in a suit of black, and towering above the surrounding throng, the thoughtful gravity of his features hushed the impatient crowd. There was a second of intense quiet, then cheer after cheer rent the air.' [1] When the crowd became still, the President-elect delivered his inaugural address. At the very beginning he made a political mistake. Buchanan said that he would not be a candidate for reëlection, and therefore could have no motive to mar his Administration by personal ambition.

That statement meant that a large part of his influence over his party in Congress and over Democratic leaders throughout the country was gone. Had the President-elect not made it, the politicians would have thought that, old as he was, he might try for another term and distribute patronage and promise, and inflict party punishments accordingly; that was the way of Presidents. In any case, the party managers and local workers would have been left in suspense as to the new President's purposes. But now they knew — four years, and Buchanan was through forever with official life! It was the first tactical error of that unfortunate Administration, and to it was due no small part of the trouble that followed.

He owed his election, declared Buchanan, to the people's inherent love for the Constitution and the Union. In the campaign popular passions had stormed because of deep and vital questions; but, the election over, instant submission followed and all was calm. Such was the result of popular self-government; in no other country on earth could the like be seen.

What a happy thought and deed it had been for Congress to apply the same basic principle to slavery in the Territories! — that wretched question, the agitation of which had done no good and caused much harm. Under popular sovereignty the people of the Territories were now to decide for themselves whether they would have slavery. That was the situation in Kansas. To be sure there was a difference of opinion as to when

[1] Poore, I, 514–5.

that popular decision could be made, whether at the time the Territory became a State, or before.

That was a matter of 'but little practical importance. Besides,' went on Buchanan, 'it is a judicial question, which legitimately belongs to the Supreme Court of the United States, before whom it is now pending, and will, it is understood, be speedily and finally settled. To their decision, in common with all good citizens, I shall cheerfully submit, whatever this may be.'

This was almost exactly what Lincoln, relying on Justice McLean's public statement about the Missouri Compromise, had said scarcely more than six months before.[1]

The dominant note of Buchanan's inaugural was the necessity of public quiet on the distressing problem of slavery in the Territories, and of attention to other matters which were at hand and must be dealt with — the surplus, the tariff, the Pacific railroad, foreign affairs. 'Most happy will it be for the country when the public mind shall be diverted from this question to others of more pressing and practical importance.'[2] To do this, as we shall see, became the supreme purpose of Buchanan's Administration, the source of his inept domestic policies, and, together with his pledge that he would not be a candidate again, the cause of his failure as the leader of his party.

When the President-elect finished speaking, the Chief Justice, in his official robes, tall, thin, scholarly looking, and very frail, rose and administered the Presidential oath. Old as he was, Taney was to live long enough to do the same service for Lincoln four years later. Next day the Chief Justice stayed at home finishing his opinion in the Dred Scott case.[3] But wrath was in store for him. The warlike Pike wrote his paper that the 'Inaugural and coming decision' would be the 'coronation' of the Slave Power: 'That crown must be torn from that brow;' but mere party manœuvring to preserve the Union could not do it — action, strong, militant action was needed.[4]

[1] See Galena speech, p. 57, *supra.* [2] *Messages:* Richardson, v, 430–6.

[3] Dispatch to all Associated Press papers, March 5, 1857.

[4] Washington Correspondence. 'J. S. P.' New York *Tribune*, March 5, in issue March 9, 1857.

The room in which the Supreme Court of the United States heard arguments and delivered opinions was, in 1857, still on the ground floor or basement of the northern wing of the Capitol, where Marshall had presided. 'Broken by pillars and arched walls,' it was in a semi-gloom, the only light coming from the rear windows. Before these, on the floor and not elevated, was a row of nine separate desks with large comfortable chairs for the Justices, who sat with their backs to the windows so that it was hard for auditors to see their faces. A railing separated the judicial desks from the remainder of the room, which was open to spectators as well as to members of the bar.[1]

Through this sombre chamber, at eleven o'clock on the forenoon of March 6, 1857, echoed the measured tones of the Court crier, as his gavel fell:

'The Honorable, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States!'

The many lawyers and numerous visitors present rose. Slowly and with deliberation, the Chief Justice at their head, the members of the Court entered, bowed to the Clerk, and took their seats. Their robes made them look impressive, although, without gowns, they were men of distinguished appearance.

'Oyez! Oyez!! Oyez!!! All persons having business before the Honorable, the Supreme Court of the United States are admonished to draw near and give their attention, for the Court is now sitting. God save the United States and this Honorable Court.'

The voice of the crier ceased, once more his gavel fell, the audience resumed their seats, and the session began. The decision of the Dred Scott case was now at last to be made public. The room was crowded.[2]

All but two of the Justices were long past middle age, three of them more than seventy, and one was eighty years old.[3]

[1] Warren, II, 200–1, quoting observers.

[2] *Ib.*, 300. *Springfield Republican*, March 7, 1857, and other papers of that date.

[3] The descriptions given in the text of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, when the Dred Scott case was decided, are from Warren, II, 202–4, 316–9; Pike's letter, March 13, in New York *Tribune*, March 17, 1857; *History of the Supreme Court:* Hampton L. Carson, I, 276–354, and other sources.

Next to the Chief Justice and on his right, sat the senior Associate Justice, John McLean of Ohio, a sturdy man, six feet in stature, with high brow, thin hair, gray eyes, dignified, austere, stern. He had been appointed to the Supreme Bench by President Jackson in 1829, was seventy-two years of age, and in service the oldest member of the Court. Next to McLean sat Justice John Catron of Tennessee, a native of Virginia, a stout, solid man of seventy-one, his features benevolent and mild, but dull. He had been appointed by Van Buren in 1837. By his side was Peter Vivian Daniel of Virginia, a tall, bony man with high cheek-bones, dark eyes and complexion, and spirited features — 'old, and long, and lean, and sharp in the visage, . . . a tremulous and fidgety old gentleman in glasses,' as the bitterly hostile Pike described him. He had been made Associate Justice in 1841, was now seventy-three years old, and was torn with grief because of the tragic death of his wife who, some weeks before, had been burned to death.

At the end of the bench was a comparatively young man of forty-eight with 'well-knit' figure, fresh wholesome complexion, square chin, 'fine expressive' eyes, and black hair, Benjamin Robbins Curtis of Massachusetts, appointed by President Fillmore in 1851, on the recommendation of Webster. He came from one of the most highly esteemed families of New England, was a graduate of Harvard, had a winning personality. Justice Curtis was an old line Whig and a stern opponent of the Republican Party on the ground that it was sectional and dangerous to peace and the Union. He had been a member of the Massachusetts Legislature at the time of Sumner's election, which he stoutly resisted on the floor of the House. Speaking as a lawyer, Curtis asserted that the deal by which Boutwell was made Governor and Sumner Senator, 'was a criminal procedure, which subjected the parties to it to a prosecution under the Massachusetts statutes against bribery.' [1] It was to this

[1] New York *Tribune*, Oct. 13, 1858. Curtis wrote the formal 'Address to the People of Massachusetts,' which was signed by 167 members of the Legislature, published in all the newspapers, and widely circulated in pamphlet form. It stated the facts in detail and was severe in the extreme. '*It* [Boutwell-Sumner deal] *is a factious conspiracy to violate a public trust, and as such criminal, not only in morals, but in the law of the land.*' Italics Curtis's. The Address is printed in full in Curtis's *Memoir*, I, 138–50.

'deal' that Douglas made reference in his dramatic rebuke of Sumner in the Senate when closing the debate over the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

To the left of the Chief Justice was James Moore Wayne of Georgia whom Jackson had placed on the Bench in 1835. His specialty was admiralty law, and even Pike admitted that he was 'intelligent.' Wayne was 'an exceedingly handsome man' of sixty-seven, above medium height, stout of figure but graceful, with ruddy cheeks, fine teeth and a thick cluster of wavy, light hair now plentifully streaked with gray. He was 'one of the Chivalry,' and, in his younger days, had been considered a great beau. He was now in poor health, and, for much of the session had kept to his bed. Next to him was Samuel Nelson of New York, made an Associate Justice by President Tyler in 1843, and now in his sixty-sixth year. He was wide-shouldered, of medium height, had a full face, blue eyes, side whiskers, and was accounted a 'handsome man.' He was notably courteous and dignified, and was the best commercial lawyer on the bench. Robert Cooper Grier of Pennsylvania, sixty-three years old, came next, 'blonde and rotund,' with 'angular brow,' strong features, blue eyes. He had been a member of the Court since 1846 in which year he was appointed by President Polk.

At the last desk on the left of the Chief Justice was a powerful looking man two years younger than Justice Curtis, John Archibald Campbell, appointed from Alabama. He was of medium height, had blue eyes, grave features, and a splendid head, which, even then, was bald. His grandfathers on both sides had been officers of the Continental Army under Washington. No man on the Bench surpassed him in intellect and only the Chief Justice and Curtis equalled him in learning. Campbell always appeared to be 'absorbed in thought' and 'to hold all elegance and imagination in utter contempt.' He was the only Justice of the Supreme Court that ever had been chosen at the written request of all the other members of that tribunal.[1] But,

[1] In 1853 Justices Catron and Curtis took to President Pierce a letter signed by the Justices asking that Campbell be appointed, and the Senate promptly confirmed his nomination by a unanimous vote. The press, especially that of the North, applauded his appointment. Connor, 16–8. Judge Connor's narrative is an excellent statement of the life and work of Justice Campbell.

said the correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, just after the Dred Scott decision, Justice Campbell's talents were only 'middling,' he was 'more Southern than the extreme South,' and any opinion by him relating to slavery in any way was of 'no more value than the cawing of a raven.' [1]

All these men were of more than ordinary ability, and two of them — perhaps three — were preëminent in mind and education; all, except McLean and Catron, were college graduates; [2] all had had fine careers at the bar or on the bench before their appointment to the Supreme Court; all had rendered good service on that tribunal. All came of Revolutionary stock, all were of high character, all had led blameless lives.[3] Until the decision of the Dred Scott case, the integrity, independence, and courage of these Justices of the Supreme Court had been universally admitted. Except for the abuse of McLean, Grier, and Curtis by Abolitionists, Free-Soilers, and radical Republicans for upholding the Fugitive Slave Law in charges to Federal Grand Juries, no one had so much as intimated a reflection upon the impartiality of any member of the Court.

The most striking figure at that historic session was the Chief Justice himself, distinguished in appearance, and notable in every way. Roger Brooke Taney, then in his eighty-first year, was a slender, loose-jointed man, slightly above six feet tall. His broad but slanting shoulders drooped, though not from age. His chest always had been so flat as to be 'noticeable.' Physically, Taney was not unlike Marshall and Lincoln; and, like Marshall and Lincoln, he was indifferent to his clothes. His face was long, forehead full and high, eyes blue and mild but unwavering and firm, mouth wide and kind yet determined.

Taney's whole expression was serene, his bearing dignified and bland — 'apostolic,' William Wirt had said, when he and Taney were rivals at the bar. In manner he was quiet; even in arguments to Court or jury when at the bar he made no gestures

[1] 'J. S. P.' in New York *Tribune*, March 13, in issue March 17, 1857.

[2] Taney and Grier, Dickinson College; Wayne and Daniel, Princeton; Curtis, Harvard; Campbell, University of Georgia; Nelson, Middlebury College. Princeton had conferred on Justice Wayne the degree of LL.D., not long before the Dred Scott decision.

[3] All but Campbell rejected Secession, and all but Campbell and Curtis remained on the Supreme Bench through the war or until their death.

and scarcely laid emphasis on words. Although of ardent temperament, he had subdued it by sheer force of will, was without visible emotion, and did not like the display of it by others. But now, said the vindictive Pike, Taney's 'forehead is contracted, his eye sunken, and his visage has a sinister expression.' [1]

The Chief Justice came from one of the old Catholic families of Maryland, and he was religious, even devout. He had been carefully educated, and had been highly trained in the law. Throughout his life he was a lover of literature and read constantly the best books and reviews published in England and in the United States.[2]

At the time of the Dred Scott decision, few lawyers then living had had so varied a career. While still a young man, Taney had succeeded Pinkney and Wirt as the leader of the Maryland bar. He had been Attorney General of that State, and then Attorney General of the United States under Jackson. Taney stanchly supported the policies of the President and became his most trusted adviser. As Secretary of the Treasury, he removed the Government deposits from the Bank of the United States, an act for which the Senate in its war with Jackson refused to confirm him; and, from the same motives, the Senate did the same thing when the President nominated him as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Upon the death of Chief Justice Marshall, Jackson named Taney as his successor; this time the Senate ratified the appointment, and thus, in 1836, he became Chief Justice of the United States.

To follow Marshall worthily was, perhaps, the hardest task any Chief Justice ever had to do; but Taney had done it well and to the surprise of all. In twenty-two years of service he had won the confidence and admiration of the bar and the country, and he was beloved, too, by his associates on the Supreme Bench.[3] His consideration for others, his calmness, courtesy,

[1] 'J. S. P.' in New York *Tribune*, March 13, in issue March 17, 1857.

[2] Tyler, 485.

[3] Resolutions of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in memory of Chief Justice Taney, Dec. 6–7, 1864, and speeches of Justice Wayne and leaders of the bar. Tyler, 486–508. Also, and especially, same by Bar of First Circuit at Boston, Oct. 15, 1864, and particularly the address by former Justice Curtis. *Ib.*, 508–16.

'He was indeed a great magistrate, and a man of singular purity of life and character.' George Ticknor Curtis in Curtis's *Memoir*, I, 239.

and 'almost feminine delicacy,' made the consultations of the Court unreserved, frank, and pleasing and the personal relations of the Justices cordial and friendly.[1]

In spite of his deep conviction that the black race was fundamentally inferior to the white and in spite of his thorough belief in negro slavery, the Chief Justice owned no slaves. Early in life he had emancipated those inherited from his father, except two or three who were too old to work; and these he supported throughout their lives.[2] Nor did any other member of the Court that decided the Dred Scott case possess slaves, unless, perhaps, Daniel and Catron owned two or three family house-servants.[3]

Taney always had been frail physically, and, testifies Justice Curtis, his friends would not have been surprised if he had died at any time during the last forty years.[4] But his simple, regular, and abstemious habits, together with his serenity, had kept him alive. In his eighty-first year, his voice, never robust nor loud, was very weak and low; but, says Justice Curtis, the sure and brilliant intellect of the Chief Justice showed no sign of becoming hesitant or dim.

Taney was now suffering from a terrible grief. Only a little more than a year before the decision of the Dred Scott case, his wife had died of yellow fever, and on the following day their last child, Alice, a young woman 'made up of loveliness alone,' also died of that plague.[5] This double blow of fate nearly killed the Chief Justice; it would appear that only his religious fervor saved him. But God had sustained him, he wrote to Curtis in answer to a letter of sympathy, although the tragedy had 'told sensibly upon a body already worn by age, as well as upon the mind; and I shall meet you [at the next session of the Supreme Court] with broken health and with a broken spirit.'[6]

Such was the man who now read, as the opinion of the Court,

[1] Curtis, in Tyler, 508–16. [2] *Washington Union*, June 24, 1857. Tyler, 478.

[3] Upon his appointment to the Supreme Bench Justice Campbell emancipated his household slaves, the only slaves he owned, and, when in Washington, hired free negroes to do housework, since the question of slavery might come before the Supreme Court while he was a member of it. Connor, 71.

[4] Tyler, 509–10. [5] Sept. 29, 30, 1855. *Ib.*, 326.

[6] Taney to Curtis, Baltimore, Nov. 3, 1855. *Ib.*, 327–8. The letter of Justice Curtis was also warmly religious. *Ib.*, 326–7.

the paper that was to become a landmark in American history. The reading took a long time, and now and then his tones were so indistinct that listeners could hardly hear what he said, an incident that added another strand to the knout with which the aged and feeble Chief Justice was soon to be lashed.

Almost at once Taney stated the main question: Under the Constitution, could a negro, the descendant of slaves, become a citizen of a State or of the Nation — a part of the 'political community' which that instrument had created? No! he answered, and, in support of that conclusion, he gave an historical narrative of how the negro race was regarded at the time the Declaration of Independence was adopted, the Constitution framed and ratified, and the Government established. Negroes were not 'then acknowledged as a part of the people,' said Taney. It was hard, 'at this day,' he said, to realize how white people the world over looked upon the blacks during the Revolutionary period. 'They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. . . . This opinion was at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals as well as in politics, which no one thought of disputing, or supposed to be open to dispute.'

All the Colonies had slaves at the time of the Revolution, said Taney; and the colonial laws and those of the original States forbade marriage between white and black, even though the negro were free — made such unions crimes and punished as criminals the person who performed such a marriage ceremony, as well as the parties to it. That showed what white people then thought of negroes.

Perhaps the words of the Declaration 'all men are created equal' might be understood in 1857 to include everybody on earth, if the Declaration were written 'at this day;' but they were not so understood at the time it was written. Otherwise the conduct of the framers of that instrument was 'flagrantly

inconsistent' with what they said, and they ought now to be scorned rather than praised. But the framers and signers of the Declaration were uncommonly able, highly educated, and very honorable men — 'great men,' indeed — and knew what they were about. They perfectly understood the words they used, spoke 'in the ordinary language of the day, and no one misunderstood them.'

This was the case, too, when the Constitution was adopted, said Taney. Of course there were then but few slaves in the Northern States, and the institution had 'entirely worn out in one of them.' But this had come to pass because climate and production had proved to be unsuited to such labor, and not in the least because of change in opinion about the black race; witness the African slave trade carried on by citizens of some of these very States — fortunes made and 'without reproach' by this, the 'worst form' in which slavery could be recognized.

And how did the free States continue to regard free negroes? As 'an inferior class,' said the Chief Justice. Look at the marriage laws of those States, their militia statutes, their police regulations, the decisions of their courts! All these things showed that negroes were not considered to be 'citizens' in any State, and, if not, then of course they could not be citizens of the United States. William Wirt, when Attorney General under President Monroe, had given an exhaustive official opinion that free negroes were not citizens;[1] so had the last Attorney General, Caleb Cushing of Massachusetts; and, upon Cushing's opinion Pierce's Secretary of State, William Marcy, had refused passports to emancipated blacks 'as citizens of the United States.'

Citizenship meant membership of the 'political' community and might exist without the exercise of political power, such as voting — women and minors, for instance. On the other hand, States might give persons the right to vote before making them citizens, as in the case of immigrants not yet naturalized. So

[1] 'I am of the opinion that free persons of color in Virginia are not citizens of the United States, within the intent and meaning of the acts regulating foreign and coasting trade, so as to be qualified to command vessels.' From Wirt's opinion, Nov. 7, 1821, as quoted in *Washington Union*, March 21, 1857.

Wirt's opinion, that of Chief Justice Daggett of Connecticut in 1834, and other opinions were published by most Southern and many Northern papers soon after the Dred Scott decision. *Richmond Enquirer*, March 26, 1857.

when free negroes were permitted to vote, they were not thereby made 'citizens of the State, and still less of the United States.' Even if a free negro should be made a citizen of the State where he lived, could he become a citizen of another State where such citizenship was forbidden? Of course not. How then could he be a citizen of the United States?

No change in public opinion could affect the Supreme Court of the United States in giving to the language of the Constitution the meaning that language had when it was written; otherwise the Court would become a 'mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day.' If any part of the Nation's fundamental law was now thought to be unjust, let it be amended as the Constitution provided; 'but while it remains unaltered, it must be construed now as it was understood at the time of its adoption.'

Did the fact that Scott and his wife had lived at Fort Snelling in the Louisiana Purchase make them free? The Missouri Compromise said so; but the Constitution gave Congress no authority to pass such an act.

The power given Congress to 'make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States' had reference only to 'territory which at that time belonged to, or was claimed by, the United States.' That clause of the Constitution was 'a special provision for a known and particular territory, and to meet a present emergency, and nothing more.'

To prove this, the Chief Justice gave a very long and specific account of the history of such territory. This, he said, 'as well as the careful and measured terms in which the article is framed,' showed that he was right. If it meant other territory to be acquired in the future, why did it not say so? — the very argument Lincoln had made in 1854 against the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

Of course the Nation could acquire new territory and govern it, but only for the purpose of ultimately making States out of it, and not that of establishing colonies and ruling them despotically. Such territory was acquired by the General Government for the benefit of all the people of the several States 'who

created' the General Government which was 'their trustee.' But in governing that territory Congress was not absolute; it could not do as it pleased. It was controlled by the Constitution which created Congress.

For example, Congress could not establish religion, forbid free speech, deny trial by jury, in the Territories; nor could it deprive any one of life, liberty, and property without due process of law, merely because that person went there to live. These rights of person and property were placed on equal footing in the Constitution; and Congress was 'in express terms' forbidden to take them away from any citizen. If Congress itself could not do that, surely it could not authorize a Territorial Legislature to do it.

Under the Constitution slaves were the property of their owners, and Congress could not destroy that property right of the owner merely because he came himself or brought his property into a particular Territory of the United States — such an act of Congress could hardly be dignified with the name of due process of law. Thus, announced the Chief Justice, the opinion of the Court was that the Missouri Compromise 'is not warranted by the constitution, and is therefore void.'

Taney made brief work of the claim that Dred Scott was made free by living in Illinois. That point had been settled by the Court in an identical case, he said.[1] When he went back to Missouri as a slave, he was governed by the laws of that State as expounded by its Supreme Court.

Before making an end to his long opinion, the Chief Justice sternly rebuked Dred Scott's lawyers for their indirect methods. If they believed that the Supreme Court of Missouri was wrong in deciding against Scott, and that the Supreme Court of the United States had jurisdiction to correct that error, the only legal method of procedure was by a writ of error from the State Supreme Court to the National Supreme Court. If that had been done it was 'too plain for argument that the writ must have been dismissed for want of jurisdiction in this court.'

But, said the Chief Justice, Scott's attorneys did not do that. Instead they let the case be sent back to the trial court 'where it

[1] Strader *et al. vs.* Graham, 10 Howard, 82.

is still continued, and is, by agreement of parties, to await the judgment of this court on the point' of jurisdiction. In this situation the same case had been taken to the Federal Court, the same evidence given, and from the same judgment the same case thus brought to the Supreme Court, 'which the law would not have permitted him to bring directly from the State court.' Such conduct was indefensible. 'It would ill become this court to sanction such an attempt to evade the law, or to exercise an appellate power in this circuitous way, which it is forbidden to exercise in the direct and regular and invariable forms of judicial proceedings.'

With a few formal words, declaring that the Circuit Court could not give any judgment in the case because Scott was not a citizen and directing the suit to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction,[1] the Chief Justice concluded. It had taken him nearly three hours to read his opinion. Exhausted, he sank back in his chair. Justices Nelson and Catron read their separate opinions, the other Associate Justices deferred the reading of theirs until next day, and the Court adjourned.

On Saturday, March 7, 1857, 'a larger number than usual of attentive auditors' were again present when the Court began its session.[2] Justices Wayne, Daniel, Grier, and Campbell read separate concurring opinions; all agreed with the Chief Justice that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional; but Daniel, Catron, and Campbell gave different reasons.[3] Wayne's opinion was positive and brief. One statement in it is vital to an understanding of the reason that the majority said anything at all about the Missouri Compromise. 'The case involved private rights of value, and constitutional principles of the highest importance, about which there had become such a difference of opinion *that the peace and harmony of the country required the settlement of them by judicial decision.*'[4]

In a statement of a single short paragraph, Justice Grier announced his concurrence with Taney;[5] and Justice Nelson delivered the opinion on the question of jurisdiction which he had

[1] Dred Scott *vs.* Sanford, 19 Howard, 399–454; Miller's edition, II, 2–57.
[2] Warren, II, 300. [3] Howard, 469–529; Miller, 72–132.
[4] *Ib.*, 57–60. Italics author's. [5] *Ib.*, 72; Howard, 469.

prepared at the time when the majority had decided not to pass upon the Missouri Compromise.[1]

The opinion of Justice Campbell was worthy of his great reputation. At one point he stated in bold, strong words the theory that had caused dissension since the Government was founded and is still a source of sharp dispute — 'the radical error,' as Campbell called it, 'that the federal government may lawfully do whatever is not directly prohibited by the constitution.' This, said he, 'would have been a fundamental error, if no amendments to the constitution had been made;' but by the tenth amendment, 'the powers of the federal government are limited to the grants of the Constitution.'[2]

The dissent of Justice McLean was not overlong, but it was emphatic in the extreme and delivered with aggressiveness, and it was not wholly without the flavor of politics.[3] He strongly intimated that the Chief Justice had been guilty of sharp practice. 'All slavery has its origin in power, and is against right. . . . Such a discovery [the unconstitutionality of the Missouri Compromise] at this late date is more extraordinary than anything which has occurred in the judicial history of this or any other country. . . . The principle laid down will enable the people of a slave State to introduce slavery into a free State. . . . A slave . . . bears the impress of his Maker, and is . . . destined to an endless existence.'

The ambitious old Justice came near advising public disobedience to the judgment of the Court on the Missouri Compromise. 'Nothing that has been said by them [majority of Court], which has not a direct bearing on the jurisdiction of the court, against which they decided, can be considered as authority. I shall certainly not regard it as such.' And McLean announced the doctrine which Douglas was to advance in his debate with Lincoln at Freeport — the theory that slavery could not exist any-

[1] Miller, 60–72; Howard, 457–69.

[2] Howard, 506; Miller, 109. Another statement of Justice Campbell is of historical importance: 'The sentiment is now (1857) general, if not universal, that congress had no constitutional power to impose the restriction' that Missouri should have a Constitution designated by Congress.

[3] 'McLean surely used words which were almost as extreme as any spoken upon the stump by an anti-slavery orator. . . . No more uncompromising dissent was ever filed.' Steiner, 358.

where except by virtue of municipal law. 'What gives the master the right to control the will of his slave?' asked Justice McLean, and he answered, 'The local law, which exists in some form.' Where there were no such statutes, there could be no slavery.[1]

At last Justice Curtis read his famous dissenting opinion. Swiftly he came to the question whether a free negro whose ancestors were slaves could be a citizen. If 'any such person' could be, then Dred Scott must be so adjudged, since the only fact of record given to show that he was not a citizen was his descent from slaves. If he was the citizen of a State, then he was a citizen of the United States; for that had been true under the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution continued that arrangement.

In five States[2] at that time, free, native-born negroes were not only citizens, but they could vote if they had other necessary qualifications.[3] So they were also citizens of the United States and Congress could not take that right away from them. If it could, it had the power 'to create privileged classes' who, alone, could be citizens of the United States; and the Constitution gave Congress no such power.

Not only did the fundamental law guarantee to the citizens of the several States 'the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States,' said Curtis, but the fact was that in five States, at least, free native-born negroes were a part of the people who ratified the Constitution and for whom it was made. So the mere fact that Dred Scott was the descendant of negro slaves was not inconsistent with his citizenship.

The power given Congress to govern territory belonging to the United States was not confined to the domain owned by the National Government when the Constitution was adopted; for, at that time, Georgia and North Carolina had not yet ceded their great tracts, although it was expected that they would do so. Surely the Constitutional provision applied to that territory as well as to the territory already granted by Virginia.

[1] Howard, 529–64; Miller, 132–68.

[2] New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and North Carolina.

[3] Chiefly of property.

The Constitution was meant to continue indefinitely; so why narrow down a provision of it which was broad enough 'to embrace all territory belonging to the United States throughout all time?' Especially when it was admitted that the Constitution 'authorized the acquisition, from time to time, of other and foreign territory?'

The power given Congress to make rules and regulations for the Territories meant power to legislate for them. The word 'regulate,' or 'regulation,' was used four times in the Constitution; and in every case, it involved legislation — the regulation of interstate commerce, for instance. See what a great body of laws Congress had enacted for that purpose — and municipal laws, too. So Congress could pass any statutes it pleased for the Territories, except as the Constitution forbade. But the fundamental law did not say that Congress should not prohibit slavery in the Territories. Even if that point were doubtful, contemporaneous construction from the beginning of the Government up to the present moment settled the question.

For Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories did not deprive any citizen of his property without due process of law. If this was not so, then Congress itself had violated the Constitution when it abolished the African slave trade. If an American citizen owned slaves in Cuba and brought them into the United States, they became free under the Federal statute.

Such are imperfect examples of the reasoning by which Justice Curtis showed that the Missouri Compromise was constitutional.

But he made a new point which was not answered and which was conclusive. Dred Scott had married Harriet in free territory where the law gave them that right. A marriage, valid where made, was valid everywhere. Yet, if under Missouri law they again became slaves when they returned to that State, their marriage was also annulled and their children bastardized. The Constitution expressly prohibited any State to make a law impairing the obligations of a contract, and marriage was the most solemn of all contracts. Moreover, when Dr. Emerson consented to that marriage in free territory, he effectually emanci-

pated his slaves. Obviously, the fact of Dred Scott's marriage and Dr. Emerson's consent to it was not made known to the Supreme Court of Missouri, said Curtis.

Like Justice McLean, Justice Curtis also said that slavery was made possible only by local legislation. 'The liability of the master for the torts and crimes of his slave, and of third persons for assaulting or injuring or harboring or kidnapping him, . . . with such police regulations as have existed in all civilized States where slavery has been tolerated, are among the subjects upon which municipal legislation becomes necessary when slavery is introduced.' [1]

At last the Republican press and speakers had something about which they could talk, the anti-slavery and anti-Southern clergy something about which they could preach. Swiftly the storm broke. Greeley ignored the high tribute of his Washington correspondent to Taney which the *Tribune* had printed with approval only two years earlier.[2] The radical Republican editor did not even wait until the opinions were made public before he assaulted the Chief Justice with unleashed fury. Acting only on the scanty synopsis of the opinion sent out by the Associated Press,[3] the *Tribune* said editorially the morning after Taney had read it, that it deserved no more respect than if made by 'a majority of those congregated in any Washington bar-room;'

[1] Howard, 564–633; Miller, 168–237. The Republican press published in full or gave extended synopses of the dissenting opinions of McLean and Curtis. For example, *Illinois Daily State Journal*, March 16, 1857, synopsis; *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 17, 18, 19, 1857, dissenting opinions in full, and extracts from that of Taney; New York *Tribune*, March 13, 14, Curtis's opinion in full, etc. That of the Massachusetts Justice was made a major Republican campaign document. It was also printed, together with Taney's opinion, in pamphlet form, and this too was circulated as a Republican campaign document. *Chicago Tribune*, March 14, 1857, and other Republican papers. Taney's and Curtis's opinions, with abstracts of others, were published by the Tribune Association, New York, price, one copy twenty-five cents, five copies one dollar, twelve copies two dollars, one hundred copies fifteen dollars.

[2] The Chief Justice 'has held and exercised a moral balance of power of vast advantage in the interpretation of large constitutional questions, while it served as an effective check upon the latitudinarian dogmas of some of his colleagues. . . . The loss of Judge Taney at any time would be a public calamity; but it would be peculiarly so now, when political considerations are pressed with so much pertinacity.' New York *Tribune*, Dec. 18, 1855, as quoted in Warren, II, 273. The Dred Scott case was then before the Supreme Court and had been for a year.

[3] That a negro, whose ancestors were slaves, could not be a citizen of the United States; and that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional.

it was a mere '*dictum* prescribed by the stump to the bench — the Bowie-knife sticking in the stump ready for instant use if needed;' the decision and Buchanan's inaugural were 'parts of one whole' — both triumphs of slavery.[1]

In the pell-mell race of abuse and misrepresentation, Beecher pressed Greeley hard. Taney had decided that negroes had no rights which the white men were bound to respect, said the radical preacher in his journal.[2] That statement was actually believed and it became the text of all who opposed slavery and attacked the courts. Republican papers took it up and rang the changes upon it.[3] No wonder Taney 'should have sunk his voice to a whisper' when he read the opinion of the slave-holding

[1] New York *Tribune*, March 7, 1857. In addition to press attacks on Taney's opinion, several careful and lengthy reviews by lawyers appeared in legal publications.

The most careful of these was that of Horace Gray (later Justice Supreme Court U.S.) and John Lowell in the *Law Reporter*, June, 1857, and widely circulated as a pamphlet. Yet even these severe critics expressed regretful admiration for Taney: his opinion 'is unworthy of the reputation of that great magistrate, who for twenty years has maintained the position of the intellectual as well as the nominal head of the highest tribunal of the country.'

Noteworthy, also, is an extensive legal argument, entitled 'The Right to Vote,' by E. R. Tyler, in the *New Englander*, Aug., 1857, xv, 478–526. The decision supports 'all those paltry prejudices against the negro race, which are so disgraceful to our countrymen.'

A querulous, combative, and very long attack on the decision was also made by Benton — *Historical and Legal Examination* of the Dred Scott Decision on the Missouri Compromise (1857).

The harshest *Review* was by 'A Kentucky Lawyer' (Louisville, 1857), for the South was not solid for the decision.

A scathing article, written by Timothy Farrar, appeared in the *North American Review*, Oct., 1857, LXXXV, 392–415: 'The decision is, therefore, authority for nothing.'

Other less important reviews were too numerous to be cited. Taney saw all of them, but would make no reply because, as he said, they were 'founded upon misrepresentations and perversions of the points decided by the Court;' and if 'exposed, they would nevertheless be repeated, and new ones invented to support them; he would not waste time on those who acted on the principle that 'the end will justify the means.' Tyler, 607–8.

Nevertheless, the Chief Justice, the year following the Dred Scott decision, did prepare a 'supplement' to it. This supplement was called forth by a decision of the Federal Court for the District of Indiana that an American-born negro, whose ancestors had not been brought to America as slaves, was a citizen of the United States.

Taney examined judicial decisions and public records in England and America from the middle of the 17th century down to the adoption of the Constitution in support of the Court's decision; and he reasserted at length his former arguments. From this point of view his essay is strong. It is printed in full in Tyler, 578–608.

In recent years a review of the Dred Scott decision by Professor Edward S. Corwin of Princeton, in his *Doctrine of Judicial Review* (1914), 129–57, is notable.

[2] *Independent*, March, 1857. [3] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 16, 1857.

majority — for it was mostly a pack of lies, and had no more weight than a stump speech.[1]

From the first, the charge of conspiracy was made — 'a conspiracy . . . of the most treasonable character,' to deliver the Government 'into the hands of the Slave oligarchy.'[2] The Court's decision had been rendered by slave-holders and doughfaces at the dictation of the Slave Power, and was another step in the plot of which the Kansas-Nebraska Act was a part.[3] Day in and day out, the New York *Tribune* belabored the Court. At first it urged disobedience,[4] then the 'readjustment' of that tribunal so as to reverse the Dred Scott decision,[5] then the arming of the North for 'resistance' to the invasion of the rights of the free States.[6] Even moderate Republican papers said that the Court had decided 'that slave labor and free labor are equal before the constitution and laws of the United States.'[7]

Quite as bellicose and fiery as the radicals of the East was the Republican press of the West. A decision by slave-holders and 'doughfaces;' under it slavery was to be forced upon the free States; it brought 'visions of coffle-gangs on their way through Illinois or Indiana to Kansas or Minnesota;' Chicago might become a 'slave market and that men, women, and children may be sold off the block in our streets;' the decision was 'a part of

[1] New York *Tribune*, March 10, 1857. These attacks did not cease with Taney's death. In 1865 a terrible pamphlet against him, entitled *The Unjust Judge*, was widely circulated: he had been made Chief Justice because Jackson hated the Supreme Court; his judicial opinions were 'too trivial and dull, even to be read;' he had been the worst of all judges except Pontius Pilate, etc., etc.

[2] *New York Evening Post*, clipped in *Liberator*, March 20, 1857.

[3] New York *Tribune*, March 21, 1857, editorial. 'The five slaveholders who made this decision.' *Ib.*, April 1, 1857. 'The slaveholders' majority in the Supreme Court of the United States.' *Ib.*, April 2, 1857. 'The slaveholders' decision.' *Ib.*, April 11, *et seq.*

[4] 'All the freedom which we enjoy has been won by resistance to power, and only after vigorous struggles with crowned rascals and unjust judges.' *Ib.*, March 14, 1857.

[5] *Ib.*, March 16, 1857.

[6] 'We intend to strike directly at the usurping power. . . . Forced into war, driven into straits where one party or the other must sink, we go for sinking Slavery. . . . The Free States, acting in their own separate and independent capacity, must accomplish the work. . . . They must train their people, and organize their military resources, not for war but for defense. They must assert their sovereignty, and be ready to defy all possible assaults upon it. . . . The North must learn to *act* as well as talk. . . . Usurpation must be met by revolt. . . . The States must move directly upon the object they combat.' Pike's Washington letter, March 23, in issue March 27, 1857.

[7] *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican*, March 7, 1857.

the grand conspiracy against Freedom.' [1] In Springfield, Illinois, the Republican organ declared that according to the Supreme Court 'slaveholders of Missouri can bring their slaves into Illinois, . . . thus virtually making our soil a *slave State*. . . . Freedom and white men are no longer safe.' [2]

The decision was 'infamous,' it had 'aroused the whole North!' Let the Justices of the Supreme Court be elected by the people, an Illinois country editor cried on the same day that Taney read his opinion. Those who knew the fate of slaves were 'aroused to the terrible calamity of such a doom' as that to which Dred Scott and his family had been condemned.[3] Taney, his 'brother slave-holders,' and the two Northern 'doughfaces' on the Supreme Bench, were 'the abject tools of the slave Oligarchy;' [4] let a Convention of the Northwestern States be called and the people 'take their government into their own hands;' [5] cause 'every living thing in the sixteen free States, to be draped in mourning;' [6] let a 'Grand Northern League for self-protection' be formed, and let every Republican State pass statutes treating as kidnappers those United States Marshals who tried to execute the Fugitive Slave Law, denying appeals to Federal Courts; and let it back those State laws by its 'whole police and military force, . . . in opposition to any power.' Of course, this might violate the Constitution and 'clash with the United States authorities — *but what of that?*' [7]

Even more fierce were the clergy. Typical of sermons against all human law which anybody thought to be in conflict with 'God's law,' was one preached April 5, 1857, by Rev. George Barrell Cheever, pastor of the Church of the Puritans in New York. Statesmanship could not be separated from conscience, he said, nor religion from politics. When sin and Satan usurped power, it was 'the duty of everyone to disobey. . . . Such a government ought to be put out of existence, as a piracy against mankind. . . . Our submission is sin. . . . Suppose our govern-

[1] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 13, 14, 16, 17, *et seq.*, 1857.
[2] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, March 9, 19, 24, *et seq.*, 1857. Italics *Journal's*.
[3] *Aurora Daily Beacon*, March 6, 11, 1857. [4] *Rockford Register*, March 21, 1857.
[5] *Quincy Whig* and *Belleville Advocate*, Apr. 8, 1857.
[6] *Urbana Union*, Apr. 16, 1857. [7] *Aurora Daily Beacon*, Apr. 18, 1857.

ment becomes so perverted that a revolution becomes necessary — what then? It takes virtue to make a revolution.' [1]

With sad and regretful calmness the Chief Justice bore the abuse. 'At my time of life when my end must be near, I should have enjoyed to find that the irritating strifes of this world were over, and that I was about to depart in peace with all men and all men in peace with me,' he wrote to former President Pierce. 'Yet perhaps it is best as it is. The mind is less apt to feel the torpor of age when it is thus forced into action by public duties. And I have an abiding confidence that this act of my judicial life will stand the test of time and the sober judgment of the country.' [2]

Moderate papers denounced 'religious firebrands' like Cheever and Beecher, who would overthrow all civil government; their purpose was to set up a 'theocracy' in the place of 'our representative and judicial systems;' politicians would make use of such 'religious fanaticism' for party purposes; if a stop was not put to it, there probably would be 'a terrible political revolution in 1860.' [3]

In alarm the *New York Herald* said, two days after it published Cheever's sermon, that the excitement was spreading; that three thousand New England preachers would soon be following

[1] *New York Herald*, April 9, 1857, which printed Cheever's sermon in full that its readers might see what radical preachers were saying. It was one of a course of such sermons delivered by Cheever, who attracted great crowds. Most anti-slavery preachers soon concentrated their attacks upon the Supreme Court. *Illinois Daily State Register*, March 24, 26, 1857.

[2] Taney at Fauquier Sulphur Springs, Virginia, to Pierce at Concord, N. H., Aug. 29, 1857. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, x, 358–9. Taney said that the attacks were like those made on him when, as Secretary of the Treasury, he removed the deposits — 'in the same spirit and by many of the same men.'

Rev. Samuel Nott, Congregational minister at Wareham, Mass., one of the famous Nott family of clergymen and educators, wrote a remarkable pamphlet in which he approved Taney's opinion, and sent his essay to the Chief Justice.

Taney made answer in a long letter describing, in moderate and obviously truthful terms, the relations of master and slave, and, in general, Southern conditions with reference to slavery and abolition.

As to the Dred Scott decision, Taney said that he hoped Dr. Nott's 'fair' review would 'correct some of the misrepresentations which have so industriously been made, and . . . by many . . . who must have known better.' But Taney would not violate judicial proprieties, he said, by controversy with untruthful assailants. 'The opinion must be left to speak for itself.' Taney to Nott, Aug. 19, 1857. *Proceedings Mass. Hist. Socy.*, XII, 445–7.

[3] *New York Herald*, April 9, 1857, editorial.

his example; that 'the whole North will evidently be preached into rebellion against the highest constituted Court in the country;' that the radicals wanted a revolution like that which followed the Stamp Act, a new Lexington, and Bunker Hill, on the ground of slavery, civil war with the South — our own kindred — servile insurrections, the burning of cities, the massacre of women and children, commerce stopped, industry ruined, and all 'because the Supreme Court decides that negroes are not citizens.' [1]

Such papers as the New York *Times* at first sternly condemned the decision, albeit in restrained terms. 'No issue will probably ever be made upon it before the people — for the practical settlement of the question will anticipate any political result that might be reached.' But these cautious journals quickly became frightened and urged moderation. The agitation could result in 'no practical good;' it meant either nullification or a change in the Constitution; the decision must be reversed; but until then its authority must be acknowledged; the resolution proposed in the Legislature of New York — 'fulmination of a decree of contempt against the Supreme Court of the United States' — was not the way to go about it. 'No power on earth can establish slavery in the State of New York.' [2] Such papers soon stopped saying anything at all about the Dred Scott case. But, said the *Springfield Republican*, which severely criticized the decision, the situation was a fulfilment of Jefferson's prophecy that the Supreme Court would sap and undermine the Constitution.[3]

No lawyer, however, who was not in politics, questioned the integrity of the Supreme Court, or of any member of it. Writing in the *Memoir* of Justice Curtis, twenty-two years after the decision, his brother, George Ticknor Curtis, when criticizing the majority opinions in the Dred Scott case, gave his own view: 'No imputation is . . . cast upon the purity and good intentions of any of the judges.' [4]

The one point made by all who disapproved the decision, was

[1] *New York Herald*, April 11, 1857, editorial.
[2] New York *Times*, March 7, 9, April 11, 1857.
[3] *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican*, March 21, 1857.
[4] Curtis's *Memoir*, I, 207.

that it had not been necessary for the Court to do more than to pass upon the question of jurisdiction; all beyond that was *obiter dictum*, they said. Why decide the merits of the case, why go into the Missouri Compromise at all? This argument had more weight with the bar than all others, and it deeply influenced popular sentiment. Lincoln, however, was silent on that topic; but we shall presently hear Douglas make answer to it in terms of the stump.[1]

The conservative press finally came to the conclusion that the Dred Scott decision was a mere abstraction and amounted to nothing practically. 'The idea that any decision of the Supreme Court can re-establish slavery in the Free States is a bugbear — an absurdity. . . . It can have no practical effects.' Slavery must ultimately be decided by the laws which govern labor and production. 'If we would but permit Nature to have her own way for only a few short years!' The 'hotheads of the press and of the pulpit' were causing all the trouble.[2]

Democratic papers denounced the 'infamous and brutal' attacks on the Supreme Court, upheld the decision, and declared that the Republican crusade against it raised the issue of the Constitution and the laws as opposed to revolution and anarchy. Patriotic people would hold the decision to be a 'final settlement of grievous sectional issues,' and therefore 'almost the greatest political boon, . . . since the foundation of the republic.'[3] It came at the right time and would restore 'harmony and fraternal concord throughout the country.'[4] The case had been instituted 'solely by those who now complain of the result;' and, having lost, they were, for the same purpose, attempting 'now to appeal from the decisions of the judiciary to political club rooms.'[5]

Why should the Republicans object to the decision that

[1] In his *Doctrine of Judicial Review*, 156, Professor Corwin demonstrates that 'the Dred Scott decision was not *obiter dictum*.'

[2] *Harper's Weekly*, March 28, 1857, as quoted in Warren, II, 314, citing also *National Intelligencer*, May 29, 1857.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, March 19, 1857, and *Cincinnati Enquirer*, clipped in *ib.*, March 31, 1857; *New Hampshire Patriot* in *Washington Daily Union*, March 21, 1857.

[4] *Washington Union*, March 12, 1857. [5] *Ib.*, March 19, 1857.

negroes could not be citizens? The Free-State 'Topeka Constitution' said the same thing.[1]

How shameful the personal assaults on Taney! He was very old, very feeble, had 'no political future,' kept his office only by virtue of the Constitution, and therefore, was without motives for deciding any question except 'those of impartial justice and honest patriotism.'[2] It was the Constitution which the 'black Republican press' were really assailing;[3] Republican fury at the decision was because it destroyed the sectional party's platform.[4]

Southern newspapers, of course, hailed the decision as right and wise. The highly conservative *Alexandria Gazette*, citing former decisions, said that the question was an old one and that 'the same opinion [as that of the Court] was held throughout the country until the era of negro-worship commenced.' The issue now was whether the Constitution and laws should be upheld.[5] Moderately radical papers in the South rejoiced that 'the *nation* has achieved a triumph, *sectionalism* has been rebuked,' and the 'diabolical doctrines inculcated by factionists and fanatics' shattered by a tribunal as 'learned, impartial and unprejudiced as perhaps the world had ever seen;' but the sectionalist partisans, 'regardless of the laws of God or man,' would now assail the Judiciary and the Constitution, even to the destruction, if necessary, of the Union itself.[6]

It was to be expected that 'the Northern Geographical Sectional Party' would rage, now that its very foundation had been swept away, and even Kansas had 'ceased "to bleed"'; but, reckless as the Republicans were, it was a little surprising that they should dare, 'as a party,' to make war on the Supreme Court.[7] The South always had been willing to submit 'those great constitutional questions to the Supreme Court, and abide

[1] *Eastern* (Me.) *Argus*, as quoted in *Washington Union*, March 21, 1857.

[2] *Washington Union*, March 21, 1857, editorial, in reply to attacks on Taney by the New York *Tribune*.

[3] The *Pennsylvanian*, as quoted by *Washington Union*, March 14, 18, 1857.

[4] *Ottawa* (Ill.) *Free Trader*, March 14, April 18; *Joliet* (Ill.) *Signal*, March 31, 1857.

[5] March 16, 18, 1857.

[6] *Richmond Enquirer*, March 10, 13, 1857. Italics *Enquirer's*.

[7] *New York Express*, clipped in *Alexandria Gazette*, March 13, 1857.

its judgment;' but the Northern sectional party always rebelled when it lost; so 'we do not wonder at the indecent demonstrations of these Black Republican journals.' [1]

Southern secessionist papers, however, saw in the onslaught of radical Republican editors, preachers, and politicians, additional and conclusive evidence of Northern hostility to the South and to anything and everything that stood in the way of the sectional party; the South was in the minority and growing weaker every year, the North in the majority and rapidly increasing in strength; the North believed that the majority should govern regardless of minority rights guaranteed by the Constitution and declared by the Courts; look at the frantic revilement of the Nation's Judiciary by pulpit and press, the invasion of Virginia by Eli Thayer in continuation of his money-making scheme to abolitionize Kansas, the throngs at Cheever's sermons! '*Delenda est Carthago!*' had become the war cry of the North, its resolve 'the South subverted under a Northern dominion.' [2]

In the North, radical stump speakers made the most of their opportunity. 'A huge judicial lie has been palmed off upon you,' cried Frederick Douglass to an abolition audience in New York.[3] But the most effective appeal was the charge that the decision was the fruit of conspiracy — not the regular process of independent and honest judicial deliberation, but the carrying out of a plot. In the Senate, a year later, Seward repeated the same things that had been said throughout the North from the time the Dred Scott decision was made public.

He hinted that the suit had been brought in order to get the decision that finally had been made; spoke darkly of 'chicane in special pleading;' charged that the President had 'approached' the Supreme Court, intimating that this was done to make sure that nothing went amiss in the Slave Power's plans. Counsel for Dred Scott had volunteered 'from motives of charity,' while their opponents had been 'paid by the defending slaveholder;' the whole argument had been a mere 'mock debate,' and the

[1] *South Side Democrat*, clipped in *Alexandria Gazette*, March 18, 1857.

[2] *Charleston Mercury*, April 21, clipped in *New York Herald*, April 30, 1857.

[3] New York *Times*, May 15, 1857.

Court had given their decision to please the incoming President. This was 'judicial usurpation' — 'more odious and intolerable than any other among the manifold practices of tyranny.'

With the dramatist's art and skill Seward conjured the scenes at the inauguration — the 'coalition' of Judiciary and Executive to 'undermine the national legislature and the liberties of the people;' the whisperings carried on between the President and the Chief Justice without the crowd knowing their import; the deceitful statement of Buchanan spoken in tones as 'bland as that which the worst of all the Roman emperors pronounced when he assumed the purple,' that the extrajudicial decision would soon be made and that he would submit to it as final.

'The pageant ended. On the 5th of March, the judges, without even exchanging their silken robes for courtiers' gowns, paid their salutations to the president, in the executive palace.' It was like Charles the First receiving the base magistrates 'who had at his instance subverted the statutes of English liberty.' The very next morning Dred Scott was sent back to slavery; but from the first he had been a mere '*dummy*' in this political game, unwittingly, yet to the complete satisfaction of his adversary and was at once given his freedom as a reward.[1]

Thus, with cold deliberation, did the supreme Republican national leader give voice in the Senate to what had been said by radical journals, politicians, and preachers all through the North from the time the Dred Scott decision was announced in the press. Although Reverdy Johnson, publicly and at once, pointed out Seward's falsehoods and declared that the Supreme Court had been from mere party ends subjected to as calumnious an attack as ever dishonored human lips,[2] the New York Senator never took back a word of his charges. Yet only two years before, Seward had written to Taney asking his permission to dedicate one of Seward's speeches to him, as tribute to his purity of

[1] March 3, 1858. *Works*, IV, 585–8.

[2] Tyler, 385–91. So bitterly did Taney resent Seward's attack upon the Supreme Court, that he told Samuel Tyler that if Seward had been nominated and elected President, the Chief Justice would have refused to administer the official oath. *Ib.*, 391. And see *Seward:* Bancroft, I, 448.

character and eminent services as Chief Justice of the United States.[1]

But the language of the stump had been far bolder, that of the radical press far less restrained, than even Seward's words. The legislatures of seven Northern States [2] passed resolutions which amounted to an attack on the Court, a repudiation of its decision, an assertion of the most extreme doctrine of States' Rights. The Massachusetts Supreme Court would 'not heed the Dred Scott decision,' declared Theodore Parker.[3] Moreover, the partisan charges against Taney and the Court continued to be made and were actually believed, long after the Civil War was over.[4]

A week after the decision his constituents began to complain of Representative Chaffee. Did his wife have 'any interest in the ownership of Dred Scott and his family?' No! answered the *Springfield Republican;* 'We have been assured that these slaves long since passed out of the control of Mrs. Chaffee,' and, of course, her present husband had nothing to do with the matter.[5]

In an open letter, Chaffee promptly denied that he or his wife had any property right whatever to the negroes or any power to free them.[6] Two months later, May 13, 1857, Chaffee and his

[1] Tyler, 317–8. Taney declined.

[2] Massachusetts, New York, Maine, Ohio, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut.

[3] Parker to Miss Grover, Nov. 6, 1857. Weiss, II, 235–6.

[4] 'The Chief Justice proceeded to carry out the intentions, if not the instructions, of the Slave Power.' The decision 'was felt to be one of a series of slaveholding encroachments, the culmination of past and the precursor of those yet in store; because it was regarded as a foul stain upon the sacred ermine of the court.' Wilson, II, 527, 533 (1875).

[5] Open letter by 'Inquirer' to *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican*, March 13, in issue March 14, 1857. 'Our own opinion is that the case was made up at St. Louis, for the purpose of testing this question, and getting just the opinions which the majority of the court has given, and that Mr. Sanford, who has acted as defendant, had no active interest or personal motive in the case. We imagine that . . . it has been pushed on political grounds for political purposes.'

[6] Chaffee to editor of the *Republican*, March 14, in issue March 16, 1857. 'There is no earthly consideration that could induce me to exercise proprietorship in any human being; for I regard Slavery as a sin against God and a crime against man. In the case of Dred Scott, the defendant [Sanford] was and is the only person who had or has any power in the matter, and neither myself nor any member of my family were consulted in relation to, or even knew of the existence of the suit till after it was noticed for trial, when we learned it in an accidental way.'

Chaffee's letter was reprinted in New York *Tribune*, March 17, and thence copied

wife sold the Scott family to Taylor Blow of St. Louis 'for the purpose solely of the "*emancipation* of the family,"' and ten days afterward, they were set free.[1]

In view of the tempest in the press, the pulpit, and on the stump, a curious mass of negative evidence as to the state of the public mind thrusts itself upon us at this point. A large number of letters were written to Trumbull from all over Illinois; they came from farmers, merchants, hotel keepers, mechanics, editors, county and State officials, all members of the new party and eager for its success; for the most part they told the Senator what the people were saying and what was needed to win the next election — in short they were typical political letters such as always are sent to every man in public life. Yet, from the time of the Dred Scott decision for the ten remaining months of that year, only three of these numerous letters make any mention whatever of that case: one by a country lawyer late in May; [2] one by Koerner, congratulating Trumbull on his answer to Douglas at Springfield in July; [3] and one by the editor of a small paper at Danville who, in a long letter, gave but a sentence to the Dred Scott decision.[4]

Even Herndon, the most frequent and gossipy of Trumbull's correspondents, said nothing to the Senator about the Dred Scott decision. But to Theodore Parker, the radical abolition preacher in Boston, the junior partner wrote flaming letters: the Supreme Court had 'ruined itself; . . . calm, cool, philosophic men grit their teeth and — swear;' all good lawyers 'curse' the decision; he saw 'hell-gloom' on men's faces; the people were 'stunned and are now ready to flee or fight — don't care which;' Democratic editors were damning the Supreme Court for having ruined their party; they didn't say so, of course, but Herndon could see it 'in their eye.' [5] None of this stirring news, however,

into Republican papers generally. It was the device of an officeholder and politician, and was without truth.

[1] New York *Times*, Sept. 21, 1857. Channing, VI, 197.

[2] T. P. Cowen, Petersburg, Ill., to Trumbull, May 26, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

[3] Koerner to Trumbull, July 4, 1857. *Ib.*

[4] W. P. Haskel, editor of the *Danville* (Ill.) *Independent*, April 6, 1857. The editor says that he will propose Trumbull for the Presidency — the 'West must be recognized.' *Ib.*

[5] Herndon to Parker, March 10, 30, April 8, May 14, 1857. Newton, 109–16.

did Herndon report to Trumbull whom he ought to have kept posted; for Herndon owed to the Senator and Lincoln his recent appointment to the important and lucrative office of State Bank Commissioner,[1] an important fact which we must have in mind from now on.

The great quantity of letters to Senator John P. Hale of New Hampshire, by the same kind of people who wrote to Trumbull, displays even greater indifference than is shown in Trumbull's political correspondence. On the day the New York *Tribune* branded the Court's opinion as a 'bar-room' decision, the Chairman of the Republican Committee of Columbia County, at Hudson, New York, and the President of a Republican Club at the same place, wrote to Hale a joint letter asking him to deliver a lecture for them some time in June on the Dred Scott case. Nothing was said about it in any other letter to Hale during the whole of that year.[2]

During this same time, Orville H. Browning, who, as we have seen, was one of the best lawyers in Illinois, a founder of the Republican Party in that State and one of its most active leaders, was constantly travelling the circuit, or practising at his home in Quincy, or before the State Supreme Court in Springfield. Browning kept a diary with minute and meticulous care. In it he made note of what took place, what he said, did, or heard — the weather, hotels and food, sermons or lectures, political meetings, arguments in court, the persons upon whom he called socially, and the like. During all of 1857, the only entry making reference to the Dred Scott case says that in Springfield Douglas made a speech upon it.[3]

Until that time, indeed, there had been a political 'lull' in Illinois, testifies Herndon.[4]

[1] Herndon to Trumbull, March 2, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

[2] John Stanton Gould and Hiram W. Dixon to Hale, March 7, 1857, on letterhead of Republican Reading Rooms, Hudson, N.Y. Hale MSS., New Hampshire Historical Society.

The people must be made ready 'for the specific action which may be ultimately agreed upon. In order to accomplish this object no time should be unnecessarily lost nor should the wave of popular enthusiasm which swept over us last fall be allowed to subside.'

[3] Browning's *Diary*, I, 289, June 12, 1857.

[4] Springfield Correspondence, New York *Tribune*, June 30, issue July 6, 1857, undoubtedly by Herndon.

Still more puzzling is the absence of all comment in the correspondence of Southern leaders. At this very time, Toombs, Stephens, Cobb, then Secretary of the Treasury, and other politicians of that section wrote many letters to one another, almost entirely on political subjects.[1] Yet the only remark about the Dred Scott decision is a casual statement by Cobb that he is sending to Stephens a pamphlet containing Taney's opinion — and this at the beginning of a long letter marked 'Private,' wholly devoted to politics, chiefly about Kansas.[2] Indeed, in all private political correspondence, North and South, during those months, plenty is said about Kansas, the Mormons, public lands, hard times; but practically nothing about the judicial pronouncement which radical newspapers, preachers, and politicians were loudly declaring had prepared the way to spread slavery over the whole land, and therefore had convulsed with rage the people of the North.

Upon the horizon of Kansas, storm clouds were again rising. The Legislature had provided for the election of delegates to a convention to frame a State Constitution; but the old Free-State, now the Republican Party, and in the overwhelming majority, said that they would not vote because only those who were registered could do so and no registration had been made in half of the counties; and also because the law had been passed by the 'bogus' legislature which they had refused to recognize. All this was true, but another motive strengthened their resolution; they wished to keep rigid their party's almost military discipline and feared that it would be weakened if they took part in such an election, an idea encouraged if not suggested by some Republican newspaper and managers outside the Territory. Moreover, the Free-State Party had refused in some counties to permit any registration to be made.

In Utah, actual conditions were much worse, except that there the slavery question was not involved and, especially — and, indeed of consequence — the fight between political parties did not becloud what took place as it did in Kansas. The Mormon revolt was one of the gravest problems the new Administra-

[1] *Rept. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1911, II, 398–462.

[2] Cobb to Stephens, July 23, 1857. *Rept. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1911, II, 407.

tion had to handle. But it was more political shot in the Republican locker; here, said they, was another foul offspring of popular sovereignty. Polygamy in Utah! Slavery in Kansas! What next? Soon the whole Nation would become a sink of bondage and filth.

Such was the state of things when the second clash between Lincoln and Douglas came. We are now swiftly approaching the last phase of the struggle of these men for the Senate, or rather for the Presidential nomination by their respective parties; and we must bear in mind that the Senatorial contest really began in 1854 when Lincoln made his great Peoria Speech in answer to Douglas, and that his reply to the Democratic Chieftain, to which we are now to listen, was but a continuation of the fight which is soon to reach its final stage in the celebrated Lincoln-Douglas debates.

A few weeks after Congress adjourned Douglas came back to Chicago, and early in June went to Springfield for a few days' visit. The United States Court was in session and the Federal Grand Jury, by formal resolution, asked him to make a speech on Kansas, Utah, and the Dred Scott decision. Douglas accepted, and he and the Grand Jury, which called on him in a body on Wednesday, June 10, agreed on the following Friday night, June 12, as the date for the meeting.[1]

Douglas spoke in the Hall of Representatives which was not big enough to hold the crowd that came to hear him. Governor Matteson presided.[2] 'We were pleased to see in attendance Col. W. H. Herndon, the Hon. A. Lincoln,' etc., said the Democratic organ next day, with patronizing sarcasm.[3] The speech of the Little Giant was one of the most important of his life, although

[1] Springfield Correspondence, *Chicago Times*, June 12, clipped in *Washington Union*, June 20, 1857. The custom of Grand Juries to make such requests and even to express, by resolutions, their opinions on grave public questions, had not then been abandoned; but it usually was done at the suggestion of the Federal Judge or District Attorney. However, it was arranged in this instance, and it was not wholly partisan, since men of all parties were members of the Grand Jury.

[2] The throng was 'unprecedented in the annals of political assemblages,' the Hall 'a perfect jam.' *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 13, 1857. The *State Register* printed the Grand Jury's resolutions for two issues before the meeting.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 15, 1857. Also see Lincoln's statement, *Works*, II, 315.

it is possible that he did not then realize that fact. He was the outstanding leader of his party, without a rival in the North and with no one in the South who could match him in dominance of personality or strength of mind; and he was now to state the program of his party and to formulate the issues upon which it would make its next fight.

Douglas was in good physical condition, better than he had been for several years. Everybody made note of the improvement — his skin was clearer, his clothes neater, his manner, if prouder than ever, kind, even urbane. We shall presently see the reason for this change, a reason that affected his state of mind when he made, as he soon did, one of the most daring decisions that any politician ever made.

Douglas spoke extemporaneously, with unwonted deliberation but with his usual force. He afterwards wrote out what he said for publication, an incident of which, as we shall see, the Republican press made vigorous use. He was surer than ever, he said, that the principle of popular sovereignty was right. By the election of delegates to a Constitutional Convention, Kansas was about to speak for herself. All was now peaceful in that hitherto distracted Territory. If, for partisan purposes, any faction, 'acting under the advice of political leaders in distant States,' should refuse to vote in order to leave 'the free state democrats in a minority,' and a pro-slavery constitution was thus secured against the wishes of a majority of the people, the responsibility must be placed upon the shirkers. 'Upon them and upon the political party for whose benefit and under the direction of whose leaders they act, let the blame be visited.'

What should be done in Utah was plain, said Douglas. If it should prove to be true that unnaturalized foreigners there and others, acting as an organization under a spurious government of their own, were defying the National Government and threatening to subvert it, setting afoot armed bands of murderers and driving out all other immigrants, let the President at once send all the military force that might be required to enforce the laws of the land: let Congress promptly abolish Territorial Government in Utah and place that country under military laws applicable to it. That was the way to deal with treason and crime,

that was the way to handle alien enemies and outlaws, thundered Douglas. Popular sovereignty did not apply to such people, because they were not citizens and they rejected the sovereignty of the United States.[1] The crowd cheered madly.

Popular sovereignty exercised by good citizens, would banish sectional strife and bring once more throughout the Nation that concord and brotherhood which had 'animated the fathers of the revolution.' Already the slavery issue had dwindled down to the narrow limits of the Dred Scott decision. Yet even before the opinions in that case could be published, a partisan press began to pour forth torrents of abuse and misrepresentations, Douglas charged. It had even assailed the character and motives of the venerable Chief Justice and his illustrious associates, and was continuing to do so.

If, incited by partisan leaders, the outcome of all this should be 'violent resistance to the final decision of the highest judicial tribunal on earth,' then the friends of order and constitutional government must rally under the 'glorious banner of the Union' against lawlessness and faction. That was the first and highest duty of every citizen of a free republic, declared Douglas. In America the will of the people as expressed in the Constitution was the highest law; the Courts — established by the Constitution, established by the people themselves — were the expounders of that law; and resistance to the final decision of the greatest of these tribunals was 'a deadly blow to our whole republican system of government.'

Thus Douglas marked out the first Democratic line of attack in the coming battle with the Republicans.

One ground for assault upon the Supreme Court, said Douglas, was that it had passed upon the merits of the case, instead of dismissing it for want of jurisdiction; and he insisted that the Court was right, legally and morally right, in deciding the main questions, all of which were really presented by the record as the Court had pointed out. But, he continued, suppose the Court had done as its foes now said it ought to have done, and thrown the case out on the point of jurisdiction? The result would have

[1] Douglas's argument on Utah was very long, with citations of laws and precedents, and no one then or thereafter controverted it.

been to 'remand Dred Scott and his children to perpetual slavery' on mere technicalities, leaving the real issue untouched.

What would the assailants of the Court have done then? Their fury would have been even greater than it was now; they would have denounced the Court 'with increased virulence and bitterness' for 'having remanded Dred Scott to perpetual slavery without first examining the merits of his case and ascertaining whether he was a slave or not.' Worse still, they would have done this 'with much more plausibility and show of fairness' — a man condemned on technicalities by a Court that dodged the merits of the case!

The decision that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional and that Congress could not destroy the right of the master to his slave, firmly established the great principle of popular sovereignty and vindicated the Kansas-Nebraska Act which put that principle into the form of law, Douglas contended. While Congress could not extinguish the slave-holder's right, it was 'a barren and a worthless right, unless sustained, protected and enforced by appropriate police regulations and local legislation, prescribing adequate remedies for its violation. These regulations and remedies must necessarily depend entirely upon the will and wishes of the people of the territory as they can only be prescribed by the local legislatures.'

Thus Douglas once more asserted the doctrine that local friendly legislation was indispensable to the existence of slavery, a doctrine he had announced seven years before in the historic Senate debate of 1850. James L. Orr of South Carolina, who, next to Stephens, was accounted the best lawyer and ablest Southern man in the House of which he was soon to be elected Speaker, and who was a fighting advocate of slavery, had said the same thing with even stronger emphasis during the heated dispute in that body over Kansas in 1856.[1]

Lincoln is to make much of this point in his debate with

[1] Orr was a strong Union man, typical of the large number of Southern men who believed in the right of secession but opposed it as bad policy. On the ground that disunion would be ruinous to the South, Orr resisted the secession of South Carolina to the very last; but when, in spite of his opposition, his State withdrew, he went with it because he thought that it had the constitutional right to secede if the majority wished, and that his first loyalty was due to his State.

Douglas next year; and the 'Freeport Doctrine' is to be exploited by the Republicans as a new device of the shifty Douglas which he was forced to adopt to escape, for a moment, the trap Lincoln set for him — a trap, moreover, into which Douglas really fell and thus lost the Presidency. In a moment we shall see how more than a year before the Freeport debate, Lincoln dealt with the theory of friendly local legislation; for he is presently to make answer to the speech of Douglas which we are now reviewing.

Where then, continued Douglas, were the folly and sin of the Kansas-Nebraska Act? Only in repealing an unconstitutional act of Congress which, moreover, had been framed on an unsound principle, and putting in the place of it a constitutional law based on a sound principle. That was not only right, but also plain common sense, said Douglas. Buchanan had been elected upon that 'naked and distinct issue;' the Supreme Court had sustained the principle of popular self-government; and, cried Douglas, 'I am willing to rest the vindication of the measure and my action in connection with it upon that decision and that verdict of the American people. [Immense Applause.]'

The Democratic champion then stated the strongest issue upon which his party was to make the next campaign. That issue was negro equality. Republican leaders said that the Dred Scott decision was 'cruel, inhuman, and infamous, and should not be respected or obeyed.' Why not, asked Douglas? Where was the cruelty, inhumanity, infamy? The Republicans said that it was in the denial to negroes of that equality of all men asserted in the Declaration of Independence; and that it was for the 'perfect and absolute equality of the races' that the battles of the Revolution had been fought. Was that true? asked Douglas. If so, the Republican conclusions must be admitted, and, as honest men, Americans should put into practice the principle of racial equality.

Just what would that mean? The instant emancipation of every slave in the country; the repeal of that clause of the Constitution of Illinois which forbade negroes to come and live among us; the bestowal of suffrage upon them; the right to hold any public office on an equal footing with white men! Nor was

that all. If the Republican interpretation of the Declaration of Independence was correct and the Republican idea of negro equality was sound, then, as 'conscientious and just men' we must 'repeal all laws making any distinction whatever on account of race or color, and authorize negroes to marry white women on an equality with white men! [Immense cheering.]'

Thus and thus only could Republican assaults on the Dred Scott decision be made good, exclaimed Douglas. Again the delighted crowd cheered. If the Republicans denied this, what became of their boasted sincerity? asked the speaker. Where was the morality or intelligence of proclaiming equality of all races and all men, and yet denying the negro the right to vote, to hold office, to 'marry the women of his choice?' — making him industrially free, and yet keeping him in political and social slavery?

Certain Republican States were now taking steps to change their Constitutions and laws so as to wipe out all legal distinctions between black and white, and the Republicans would do the same thing wherever they got the power, he asserted. Was Illinois ready for that? Of course the Republicans would not yet admit their purpose in all parts of the State — at least not until after the next election. Indeed, they would stoutly deny it in central and southern Illinois; yet Republican newspapers, speakers, and lecturers would go on asserting that the Declaration meant that 'the Almighty created a negro equal to a white man' with 'a divine right' to equal privileges, 'and that all human laws in conflict with that divine right must yield and give place to the "higher law."' That showed what the Republicans would do 'as soon as they get the power.'

The audience now being greatly wrought up, Douglas swept triumphantly on.

Did any State abolish slavery during the Revolution? Not one! and not to this day had any State put negroes on an entire equality with the white man, Douglas exclaimed. The signers of the Declaration, when they asserted that all men were born equal, 'referred to the white race alone' — that British subjects in America were the equals of British subjects in England. History taught, and the fact was, that, *at that time*, 'negroes

were regarded as an inferior race, who, in all ages, and in every part of the globe . . . had shown themselves incapable of self-government,' and requiring the protection of those who could control and care for them.

But, said Douglas, that did not mean that negroes should become slaves, or be treated as such; but only that they should have all the rights they could enjoy 'consistent with the welfare of the community where they reside;' and the extent of these rights must be settled by the people of each State and Territory.

That was the principle on which Independence was declared, the Revolution fought, the Federal Government set up; and the rights and privileges of the African race remained as they were when the Constitution was adopted, 'dependent entirely upon the local legislation and policy of the several states where they may be found.' Illinois had no more right to interfere with what other States and Territories did on that or any other domestic subject, than they had to interfere with the internal laws and policy of Illinois.

The founders of the American Nation did not expect or want entire uniformity in the legislation of different States, Douglas insisted. They did not think that either possible or desirable. So some States thought slavery best suited to their conditions, while others thought it unsuited to theirs; 'but all repudiated the doctrine of the equality of the white and black races,' all agreed that the purity of each should be preserved, all were against 'any species of amalgamation, political, social or domestic.'

And no wonder! Look at the state of things in countries where such social and political mixture had been permitted — Mexico, South America, Central America! Amalgamation always brought the superior down to the level of the inferior, never raised the lower race to the plane of the higher. What did the soldiers in the Mexican War see and hear? 'I appeal to each of those gallant young men before me' who fought in Mexico! They saw the degradation, demoralization, disease, and death that came from a mixture of racial blood. The Fathers knew that, too; they did not look upon the negro 'as any kin to them,' and they arranged our social and political institutions so that

the negro should 'never be of kin to their posterity. [Immense applause.]'

But if negroes were to be made the equals of white men at the polls and in public office, 'upon what principle will you deny their equality at the festive board and in the domestic circle?' The Supreme Court had decided that the negro could not be a citizen; the Republican, 'or abolition party,' denounced that decision and incited disobedience to it; so 'let us join issue with them and put ourselves upon the country for trial. [Cheers and applause.]' [1]

The meeting was over, the Democrats were gleeful, the old line Whigs pleased, the Republicans angry and downcast. The dispirited partisans were full of hope, however, for Lincoln would soon make answer to Douglas, expose his 'sophistries,' tear his flimsy arguments to pieces. But the Little Giant had not spoken to Springfield alone; although he did not realize it at the time, he had addressed the Democracy of the Nation, especially that of the North; he had sounded the battle cry of his party for the next conflict.

When he wrote out his speech for publication, the larger Democratic papers everywhere reproduced it in full, and so did some conservative papers; [2] while the party press generally gave extracts from it. All had editorials of approval in successive issues.[3] It was printed in pamphlet form and scattered broadcast. Notwithstanding the emphatic and reiterated assertion that slavery could be kept out of the Territories by police regulations and local legislation, the most radical of Southern journals praised the speech in extravagant terms.[4] So what Douglas had said at Springfield, June 12, 1857, became the Democratic creed — suppression of Mormon outrage with swift and iron hand, maintenance of the Constitution and the laws, above all, the supremacy of the white race.

[1] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 18, 1857. Douglas was 'enthusiastically cheered throughout and at the close three hearty and enthusiastic cheers' were given for him. *Ib.*, June 15, 1857.

[2] For instance *New York Herald*, June 24, 1857. The *Herald* said that the Springfield speech was Douglas's 'bid . . . for the next Presidency.'

[3] 'It has produced a very deep sensation.' *Washington Union*, June 23, 1857.

[4] *Richmond South*, June 20, clipped in *New York Herald*, June 24, 1857.

The Republican press poured out wrath and abuse. Douglas's Springfield speech was 'a bid for the Presidency;' [1] again he had jumped at the crack of the Slave Power's whip; the Dred Scott decision had annihilated his popular sovereignty, yet he pretended that the two were harmonious — the base little trickster! negro equality was a humbug. Amalgamation! Let Douglas look to his masters in the South for that! Personal attacks were made upon him. His character was assailed.

The fact that he afterward wrote out his speech for publication was evidence of fraud [2] — he was merely 'expurgating the real speech;' [3] he had no soul; he was like Catiline; but his power is great — indeed, 'his art, his sophistry, and his power are wonderful;' yet he was a criminal at heart — 'his hands are red with the blood of murdered Free State men.' [4] Every day for a fortnight the *State Journal* attacked him.[5]

The Democratic press replied with equal fury and with scorn. 'Take out the vulgar and ruffian-like epithets,' said the *State Register*, and nothing was left of the abuse of Douglas by the Springfield Republican paper. The Democratic organ implored everybody, even the enemies of Douglas, to read the partisan vilification of him. But such journalism was to be expected. 'Since the formation of this government no party has existed whose press was so utterly unscrupulous, venal, and corrupt as the black republican,' the *State Register* hotly charged.[6]

Thus began that newspaper virulence which, on both sides, sank to scurrility and falsehood during the Lincoln-Douglas debates the following year. Acrimony there had been before,

[1] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 7, 1857. Editorial beginning, 'Mephistopheles is abroad again.'

[2] Springfield Correspondence, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 17, in issue June 19, 1857.

[3] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 20, 1857, editorial; *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 24, 1857, which printed two 'versions' of Douglas's speech. On June 13, 1857, the *State Journal* printed a satirical report of the speech.

[4] *Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 7, 1857. Editorial.

[5] From June 23 to July 8, the *State Journal* printed a series of long and bitter reviews of Douglas's speech under these titles: 'Motive for Making it;' 'The "Forked Tongue;"' 'Kansas Affairs;' 'The Dred Scott Decision' (two reviews); 'Amalgamation;' 'Custom and History;' 'Polygamy.' One of this series was Lincoln's speech in reply to Douglas, as given below.

[6] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 18, 1857.

misrepresentation and the usual methods of party strife, but nothing like the practices now set on foot.

The Republicans looked forward to Lincoln's reply with exultant faith in their hero. 'Lincoln's speech is to be an answer to the turgid and false one of Mr. Douglas; *it will be an answer*' which his friends would not want to hear, wrote a Springfield correspondent to the *Chicago Tribune*. The Senatorial campaign of next year had begun already, he said, and the Democrats were getting ready to make a desperate fight. Everybody who knew the two men, knew that 'Lincoln is more than Douglas's equal, politically or legally — head or heart — yes, in any relation.' [1] Yes, indeed, Lincoln's coming speech '*will be an answer*,' repeated his partner in a letter to Parker; for 'Lincoln is a gentleman; Douglas is . . . an unscrupulous dog.' [2]

On the night of June 26, 1857, the Hall of Representatives where Douglas had spoken two weeks before, was, perhaps, 'comfortably filled.' [3] It was amazing, said the Democratic organ next day, that after all the Republican 'drumming, coaxing, and wheedling,' the audience was so small — only about one-fifth as many as went to hear Douglas. 'If Mr. Lincoln can no longer draw a crowd, who can?' He was easily the ablest man the Republicans had. 'If there is a republican in the state of Illinois that can cope with Judge Douglas, that man is the honorable A. Lincoln.' It was 'ominous' for the Republicans that so few would turn out to listen to such a man. [4]

A little after half past eight o'clock Lincoln came in with an arm-load of books.[5] He said that he was there partly because 'some of you' had asked him, and partly because he wanted to make some answer to Douglas's speech. He had heard Douglas deliver it and had since read it.

Lincoln was inclined to agree with Douglas about Utah: if

[1] Springfield Correspondence (certainly Herndon), *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 17, in issue June 19, 1857. Italics *Tribune's*.

[2] Herndon to Parker, June 17, 1857. Newton, 119.

[3] Correspondence of *Chicago Tribune* (Herndon's report), in New York *Tribune*, June 27, issue July 6, 1857. The *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 29, said that not more than half the seats were occupied, and many of these by Democrats who wanted to hear what reply Lincoln would make to their champion.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 27, 29, 1857. [5] *Ib.*, June 30.

the people there were in rebellion, 'they ought to be somehow coerced to obedience.' Perhaps Douglas's way was as good as any, but Lincoln was 'not now prepared to admit or deny' it. Still the Republicans could 'fall in with it without taking back anything they have ever said.' Of course, Douglas would have to back down a good deal from his 'much-vaunted doctrine of self-government for the Territories;' but it was plain from the start that 'that doctrine was a mere deceitful pretence for the benefit of slavery.' Whoever could not see that, could not be made to see 'though one should rise from the dead to testify,' argued Lincoln.

Suppressing rebellion in Utah by force was beside the point. The real question was: 'If the people of Utah shall peacefully form a State constitution tolerating polygamy, will the Democracy admit them into the Union?' The Constitution did not forbid it, and 'why is it not a part of the judge's "sacred right of self-government" for that people to have it, or rather to *keep* it, if they choose?' No mention was made of the fact that Douglas had said that, if reports were true, most of the Mormons were unnaturalized aliens and all of them in armed rebellion against the American Government whose authority they denied.

Douglas knew that the Free-State men of Kansas said they would not vote because they were not registered — at least that was asserted in the press, in public speeches and in letters, 'and borne by every mail, and blown by every breeze to the eyes and ears of the world.' Yet Douglas 'just slips along, not seeming to know there is any such question of fact.' If they had a chance to vote they ought to do so, of course, Lincoln admitted; but if only a few Free-State men had a chance to vote, 'they were perfectly right in staying away from the polls in a body.'

'By the way,' remarked Lincoln casually, the Kansas election had taken place since Douglas spoke, and the returns indicated that only about one-sixth of the registered voters had really voted, and that, too, when not more than one-half of the rightful voters had been registered. What a farce the whole thing was — 'the most exquisite farce ever enacted.'

Free-State Democrats! exclaimed Lincoln. 'Allow me to

barely whisper my suspicion that there were no such things in Kansas as "free state Democrats."' If one could be found, said he, 'I suggest that it might be well to catch him, and stuff and preserve his skin, as an interesting specimen of that soon-to-be extinct variety of the genus Democrat.'

Since Douglas had not discussed the merits of the Dred Scott decision, Lincoln would not do so either, he said, 'believing I could no more improve on McLean and Curtis, than he could on Taney.' Douglas had denounced all who questioned the decision as offering violent resistance to it: but who resists it? asked Lincoln. Republicans believed as much as Douglas — perhaps more — that the Supreme Court must be respected and obeyed.

'We think its decisions on Constitutional questions, when fully settled, should control not only the particular cases decided, but the general policy of the country, subject to be disturbed only by amendments of the Constitution. . . . More than this would be revolution. But we think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know that the court that made it has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it.'

Thereupon, Lincoln went deeper into the grave question of the nature of judicial decisions and how far they are binding, if at all, on public officials. If the Dred Scott decision had been unanimous, without partisan bias, 'in accordance with legal public expectation,' in harmony with the practice of the Government from the first, not based on false statements of history; or if the same decision had been made by the Supreme Court many times for many years, 'it then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary, not to acquiesce in it as a precedent.'

But, argued Lincoln, when a decision did not have such elements of authority, it was not even 'disrespectful' to deny that it had not 'quite established a settled doctrine for the country.' Yet Douglas had said that such a view was 'awful.'

Hear, then, what General Jackson had said on that point, when he was President! — and Lincoln read with approval Jackson's famous message to Congress in denial of Marshall's

basic opinion in McCulloch *vs.* Maryland:[1] A decision of the Supreme Court did not control 'the co-ordinate authorities of this government;' each department must 'be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution;' every official swears to support the Constitution 'as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others.'

Yet, exclaimed Lincoln triumphantly, he had heard Douglas denounce that decision and applaud General Jackson for disregarding it. Consider that fact, and see how Douglas's 'fierce philippics' against the Republicans now fall upon his own head. In that long and fierce political war, Douglas had fought in the ranks of those whom he to-day called 'the enemies of the Constitution.'

Lincoln quoted from Curtis's opinion that, at the time the Constitution was adopted, negroes were citizens and voters in five States; then read Taney's statement that it was hard to realize now, how negroes were looked upon then, and that the Declaration, if written at this day, would be understood as including 'the whole human family.' But, said Lincoln, the black man was worse off now than he ever had been; his prospects never had 'appeared so hopeless as in the last three or four years.' In two States the negro's right to vote had been taken away, abridged in another, and not extended anywhere, although the number of States had been more than doubled; in many States the very right of emancipation had been denied — even some State Constitutions forbade legislatures to give freedom to slaves; Congress and the Supreme Court had provided for the spread of slavery, whereas in the old days that extension was prohibited by 'common consent;' once the Declaration was 'held sacred by all, and thought to include all;' but now it was 'hawked at and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it.'

Yes, most certainly the negro was now in a bad way, Lincoln insisted — mammon, philosophy, even the theology of the day, all were after him. 'One after another they have closed the heavy iron doors upon him; and now they have him, as it were,

[1] For a summary of Marshall's opinion and Jackson's attack upon it, see *Marshall:* Beveridge, IV, 289–308, 530–2.

bolted in with a lock of a hundred keys, which can never be unlocked without the concurrence of every key — the keys in the hands of a hundred different men, and they scattered to a hundred different and distant places; and they stand musing as to what invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter, can be produced to make the impossibility of his escape more complete than it is.' So Taney was wrong in saying that the negro was more highly regarded now than when the Government was founded.

Douglas had 'scorned' opposition and put the Kansas-Nebraska bill through Congress, although the country was 'in a blaze;' he had been 'superseded' for the Presidential nomination; his 'chief aids' in Illinois, Shields and Richardson, had been 'successively tried, convicted, and executed for an offense not their own;' and now Douglas 'sees his own case standing next on the docket for trial' — he was in a desperate plight.

White people had a 'natural disgust' for amalgamation, said Lincoln, and Douglas hoped to help himself by making use of that disgust; in fact it was his chief hope. He clung to it 'as a drowning man to the last plank;' he got hold of it by 'lugging it in from the opposition of the Dred Scott decision;' he pretended that, because the Republicans insisted that the Declaration 'includes *all* men,' they did so only 'because they want to vote, and eat, and sleep, and marry with negroes!' and that otherwise the Republicans were not consistent. Lincoln hotly repudiated the charge.

'Now I protest against the counterfeit logic which concludes that, because I do not want a black woman for a *slave* I must necessarily want her for a *wife*. I need not have her for either. I can just leave her alone.

'In some respects she certainly is not my equal; but in her natural right to eat the bread she earns with her own hands without asking leave of any one else, she is my equal, and the equal of all others.'

The argument of Taney and Douglas, that the authors of the Declaration did not mean to include negroes because they 'did not at once actually place them on an equality with the whites,' was refuted, Lincoln held, 'by the other fact that they did not

at once, or *ever afterwards*,[1] actually place all white people on an equality with one another.' They did intend '*all* men,' but not to declare all men equal *in all respects* — color, size, intellect, 'moral developments, or social capacity' — but equal as to 'certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' Of course, the Fathers did not mean to declare 'the obvious untruth' that everybody actually enjoyed such equality at that time, but merely to announce the principle, 'so that *enforcement* of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

'They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere.'

The phrase 'all men are created equal' was not meant to be a help to us in our war for Independence, said Lincoln, but to be a 'stumbling-block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism.' The Fathers intended that, if tyrants ever should begin their work in America, 'they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.' That was the purpose of putting into the Declaration the assertion of the equality of birth — that was what it meant.

What a 'wreck — mangled ruin' — Douglas's explanation made of the Declaration! It was silly, too. Only British subjects in America and Great Britain equal! Was this all to whom the Declaration applied? If so, not only negroes, but 'the French, Germans, and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the Judge's inferior races!'

Lincoln had thought, he said, that the Declaration 'promised something better than the condition of British subjects,' oppressed as they were. If it did not, then, 'having kicked off the king and lords of Great Britain,' the Declaration gave no promise that 'we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of

[1] Italics *Journal's*.

our own.' Lincoln became sarcastic. 'I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere; but no, it merely was adopted' to justify the colonists in throwing off the British yoke! Since that had been done long ago, the Declaration was of no practical use now — 'mere rubbish — old wadding left to rot on the battle field after the victory is won.'

Why celebrate the Fourth of July next week? — 'quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day.' So when the celebration takes place, let the Declaration be read twice, first in 'the old-fashioned way' and then 'with Judge Douglas's version.'

'I appeal to all — to Democrats as well as others — are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away? — thus left no more, at most, than an interesting memorial of the dead past? — thus shorn of its vitality and practical value, and left without the *germ* or even the *suggestion* [1] of the individual rights of man in it?'

Lincoln agreed, he said — 'a thousand times agreed' — that there ought not to be 'mixing of blood by the white and black races.' There were enough white women for white men and black women for black men — so let like marry like. But under which system did amalgamation flourish best? Let statistics make answer: more than fifty-six thousand mulattoes in the free States, nearly all of whom came from the slave States, 'ready made up,' and over six times that number in the slave States 'all of home production' — and, moreover, practically all the offspring of 'black *slaves* [1] and white masters,' very few from whites and free negroes.

In States where the negro had been made 'nearest equal to the white,' there was least amalgamation — New Hampshire, for instance, with only one hundred and eighty-four mulattoes and Virginia with nearly eighty thousand, over twenty-three thousand more than in all the free States together. So statistics proved that 'slavery is the greatest source of amalgamation . . . and the degradation of the free blacks.'

The Dred Scott decision showed 'which party most favors

[1] Italics *Journal's.*

amalgamation,' said Lincoln, 'the Republicans or the dear Union-saving Democracy. . . . Could we have had our way, the chances of these black girls [Scott's wife and daughters] ever mixing their blood with that of white people would have been diminished at least to the extent that it could not have been without their consent.' But Douglas was glad to have them adjudged slaves, 'and thus left subject to the forced concubinage of their masters, and liable to become the mothers of mulattoes in spite of themselves.'

Of course, explained Lincoln, he meant this only as an illustration; he did not 'intimate' that the owner of Dred Scott and his family 'or any more than a percentage of masters, generally, are inclined to exercise this particular power which they hold over their female slaves.'

Obviously Lincoln did not know that the Scotts had been emancipated nearly six weeks before he made this speech, although that notable event had been chronicled in the St. Louis newspapers, and many of these were taken and read in Springfield.

The only 'perfect preventive of amalgamation,' Lincoln insisted, was the separation of the races; but since that could not be done at once, 'the next best thing is to *keep* them apart *where* [1] they are not already together.' For instance, if whites and blacks 'never get together in Kansas, they will never mix blood in Kansas.' Lincoln could not assert, he said, that all Republicans were for racial separation, or that the party, as a party, was for it; 'but I can say a very large proportion of its members are for it, and the chief plank in their platform — opposition to the spread of slavery — is most favorable to that separation.'

Colonization of negroes in Africa was the only way to bring it about, declared Lincoln; and he bemoaned the fact that no political party was doing anything for colonization. It was a hard job; 'but "where there is a will there is a way," and what colonization needs most is a hearty will.' When the people should come to see that it was 'morally right' and also to their interest, or, at least, not against it, 'to transfer the African to

[1] Italics *Journal's*.

his native clime, we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be.'

The Republicans taught that the negro was a man, 'his bondage is cruelly wrong,' and that slavery should not be extended, and thus, Lincoln said, they were creating a sentiment for colonization. But the Democrats 'deny his manhood,' deny or belittle his bondage, crush sympathy for him, 'excite hatred and disgust against him,' call the spread of slavery 'a sacred right of self-government' — and thus discourage colonization.

No wonder! 'The plainest print cannot be read through a gold eagle; and it will ever be hard to find many men who will send a slave to Liberia, and pay his passage, while they can send him to a new country — Kansas, for instance — and sell him for fifteen hundred dollars.' [1]

With these words Lincoln brought his reply to Douglas to a close. It was a grand speech, said the *State Journal* three days later, 'overwhelming,' unbeatable, Douglas's 'sophistries' were utterly crushed. The *State Register*, on the other hand, was mildly contemptuous; Democrats who heard Lincoln smiled broadly and congratulated one another, it said, while the 'black republicans' looked 'woebegone.' Lincoln had stated that Douglas had spoken to 'controvert' his opinions: let Lincoln subdue his vanity. Douglas never had a thought of Lincoln's views when he made his speech, and 'did not know or care whether Mr. Lincoln had any opinion at all or not.' Lincoln had 'large expectations' of succeeding Douglas as Senator; but, asked the Democratic organ, could 'a single individual,' not wholly a partisan, who had heard the two men, be 'willing to supersede Judge Douglas with Mr. Lincoln?' [2]

Democrats had felt sorry for Lincoln when the Republicans 'shamefully betrayed and cheated him' and elected Trumbull, who was far beneath him in talent; but when they saw Lincoln join 'the small ends of all parties' just to get office, saw his conduct toward Douglas, and heard him argue for negro equality, they and 'all right thinking men' thought him 'contemptible.'

[1] *Works*, II, 315–39. The *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 29, 1857, printed Lincoln's speech in very small type.

[2] *Illinois State Register*, June 30, 1857.

Lincoln did not complain that the Kansas Republicans in their so-called Topeka Constitution forbade free negroes even to come into the State, and yet he assailed the Supreme Court of the United States for deciding that a negro could not be a citizen.

Worse still, Lincoln had said that Douglas 'wanted Dred Scott's daughters kept in slavery so that they might be forced into concubinage. Comment is unnecessary.' [1] It was mere 'idle ranting of insane fanaticism' for Lincoln to say that the Fathers declared 'an universally acknowledged inferior . . . to be their equal,' and yet withheld 'every right and every privilege;' that would prove that 'instead of a band of patriots, they were nothing more nor less than a band of hypocrites.' [2]

Lincoln repudiated amalgamation and yet tried to prove the equality of white and black, went on the Democratic organ. He complained that the negro was worse off now than he ever had been. If so, whose fault was it? That of agitators who had induced slaves to escape and then let them 'starve in freedom,' incited slave uprisings, taught the blacks that murder of masters was 'but an act of justice. . . . The white man, in self defence, was forced to impose restrictions upon the negro.' That state of things was 'wholly attributable to Mr. Lincoln and his associates.' The same men had inculcated hatred of the South.[3]

In short, said the Democratic organ, Lincoln's argument was weak, his stand indefensible. 'The *Journal*, from the time the speech [of Douglas] was delivered has been guilty of telling more infamous and villainous lies than all other black-republican papers combined. . . . From this time forward the *Journal* will have quite enough to do to defend the Hon. A. Lincoln's speech.' [4]

Little further comment on Lincoln's speech was made by the Republican press, and four days after he delivered it, Trumbull went to Springfield and made another, which was acclaimed as 'truly grand and thrilling.' The Dred Scott decision, cried Trumbull, was the 'odious and infamous opinion of a slave

[1] *Illinois State Register*, July 27, 1857.

[2] *Ib.*, July 3, 1857, editorial on 'Hon. A. Lincoln's Speech.' In the same issue the charge was made that there were two versions of Lincoln's speech — 'the proof is at hand.'

[3] *Ib.*, July 2, 1857. [4] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 29, 1857.

driving court' which must be 'wholly and totally revolutionized.' [1] Trumbull's followers thought that his answer to Douglas was much better than that of Lincoln, who, said Koerner, was 'an excellent man, but no match to such impudent Jesuits and Sophists as Douglas.' [2] But Herndon was loyal to the senior partner. 'Douglas's speech was a low, gutter-rabble rousing speech; Lincoln's was gentlemanly, strong, and conclusive,' he assured Parker, to whom he sent Lincoln's best wishes together with his speech.[3] In such fashion were efforts put forth to break the 'lull' which Herndon declared held the people in its somnolent grasp.

So ended the second bout between the two men in the duel, the finish of which we presently shall see. Both had said practically all they had to say, and the most that they ever did say upon racial equality, the Declaration, the Constitution, the Courts. Hereafter, we shall find them putting old arguments on these subjects in new forms; and dealing afresh only with novel situations which, even now, are swiftly approaching. In the final phase of this encounter, we shall find one always on the aggressive, the other on the defensive, parrying thrusts, changing ground, his cautious blade darting home when an opening is found. Such were the characters of the duelists, such had been their methods from the first, such they were to continue to be to the last.

As we have observed while listening to him, Lincoln said nothing at all about Douglas's assertion that slavery could not last anywhere without friendly local legislation and police regulations. And just as he did not in 1854 endorse the charge that the Slave Power procured the repeal of the Missouri Compromise,[4] so now, in 1857, he did not repeat the accusation that the Dred Scott decision was a part of the same plot by that malign influence.

Not until Republican leaders in the Senate next year, as a matter of party strategy, concentrated their attacks on the complicity of the Supreme Court in a crafty scheme to spread slav-

[1] Springfield Correspondence, *Chicago Tribune*, July 2, 1857.

[2] Koerner to Trumbull, July 4, 1857, as quoted by *Era:* Cole, 155.

[3] Herndon to Parker, July 4, 1857. Newton, 122–3. [4] See Vol. III, Chap. V.

ery over the whole country, did Lincoln take up that indictment. When, at last, he did so, we shall hear him state that charge, albeit indirectly, in simpler and more persuasive fashion than any one else had stated it, or ever was to state it. We shall also hear him finally make use of the theory that Douglas had so long and often advanced, that slavery could not live without local friendly laws.

But just now, having delivered his speech in reply to the man he hoped to overthrow, Lincoln hurried to New York,[1] to make sure of his fee from the Illinois Central Railroad. Upon his return, Lincoln again took up his practice of the law, so often and so long neglected, and secured one employment that added another big fee to his professional receipts for that lucrative year, and was not wholly without advantages in politics.[2] So with law practice improving and with clouds lifting from the skies of his political ambition, Lincoln reached the forty-ninth year of his life.

[1] Herndon to Parker, July 29, 1857. Newton, 123–4.

[2] The Rock Island Bridge case. See Vol. II, 301.

CHAPTER III

DEMOCRATIC SPLIT AND REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY

I will stand by the American Union as it exists under the Constitution. If standing firmly by my principles, I shall be driven into private life, it is a fate that has no terrors for me. DOUGLAS, in the Senate, March 22, 1858.

Douglas is a brave man. Forget the past and sustain the *righteous*. GREELEY to HERNDON, March, 1858.

A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe that this government cannot endure, permanently, half *slave* and half *free*. . . . It will become *all* one thing or *all* the other. . . . 'A *living dog* is better than a *dead lion*.' Judge Douglas if not a *dead* lion *for this work* [opposing slavery extension], is at least a *caged* and *toothless* one. LINCOLN, at Illinois Republican State Convention, June 16, 1858.

LINCOLN'S second trip to New York was a race with that financial storm, already under way, which was soon to sweep over the whole land and leave the business structure of the country in ruins. When, with his battered carpet-bag and old bulging umbrella, wearing his ill-fitting clothes and the weather-beaten hat, he took the train at Springfield soon after his reply to Douglas, destructive commercial winds were already high and blowing with ever-increasing and ominous strength. For a long time conditions had been growing worse, and now the weaker timbers of the vast but flimsy edifice of credit, were beginning to break. Indeed, even before his first journey to New York, in March, 1857, a country bank here and there in Illinois, had collapsed.[1] Just before Lincoln again started for New York, the Bank of Commerce at Chicago failed,[2] and other institutions faced closing.

The newspapers, all of which Lincoln so constantly read at the *Journal* office and several of which he took, had made brief note of these bad signs. But Lincoln had better means of knowing what was going on in the world of banking and trade than

[1] Of sixty-one State banks in Illinois, three had failed, and eleven were closing. *Rockford Register*, Feb. 7, 1857. The Bank of Ottawa suspended in March. *Ottawa Free Trader*, March 21, 1857. 'How long are the people to be cheated out of their earnings by these swindling rag mills.' *Aurora Daily Beacon*, April 2, 1857. Two banks in St. Louis decided not to accept the notes of most Illinois banks. *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Jan. 31, 1857.

[2] *Ottawa Free Trader*, July 11, 1857.

the scanty items in the papers. His intimate friend, client, and adviser, Jacob Bunn, kept him well posted. Also, Herndon knew what was taking place. As Bank Commissioner of Illinois, it was the business of the junior partner to gather data on that very matter.[1] The State Auditor, Jesse K. Dubois, too, was as well informed. If satisfaction of Lincoln's judgment against the Illinois Central Railroad Company was not to be long delayed, he must act quickly.

Soon after his return from New York the fee was paid, and, thus equipped with the largest amount of cash he ever received in a lump sum before he became President, Lincoln went forward with his political plans. Of these, the one immediately before him was that of beating Douglas for the Senate next year. But Lincoln's career was now wholly dependent upon the success of the Republican Party, and big events, decisive of its fortunes, came swiftly.

In less than a fortnight after the Railroad Company deposited to Lincoln's credit in his bank at Springfield, the four thousand and eight hundred dollars due him, the general financial crash began with the failure of the largest money-lending concern west of the Alleghanies.[2] Quickly the panic spread over the whole country. By the end of October, nearly every bank in the North and many in the South had suspended.[3] Within two months after they had reluctantly sent Lincoln his money, the harried directors of the Illinois Central Railroad Company were forced to make an assignment, and all payments were stopped, except those for bare operating expenses.

Industry was paralyzed. Farmers could not sell their grain. Factories shut down. Tens of thousands of laborers were thrown out of work. In New York great meetings of the un-

[1] Thomas Quick and Herndon to Trumbull, Oct. 11, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

[2] The Ohio Life and Trust Company of Cincinnati, which closed its doors Aug. 24, 1857. This institution, operating under one of the easily obtained and all-inclusive charters of that day, did little or no insurance business, but, by means of loans, speculated in lands and all sorts of securities, especially railroad stocks. The credit structure of the North was shot through with its operations and deals. *Cincinnati Enquirer* and *New York Herald*, clipped in *Chicago Daily Times*, Aug. 27, 1857.

[3] New York *Tribune*, Sept. 28, Oct. 14, 15, *et seq.*, 1857. Southern banks, however, were in much better condition. *Washington Union*, Sept. 29, 1857; *Lynchburg Virginian*, clipped in *Alexandria Gazette*, Sept. 11, 1857.

employed were harangued by agitators. The doctrine that society must provide the means of livelihood to all who were willing to toil was preached with fury — labor was above capital; the man above the dollar, it was said. Riotous processions marched. Dangerous crowds assembled in the financial district.[1] In other cities, the state of things was almost as bad — everywhere it was threatening. Vast impetus was given to the labor movement, which, as we have seen, had begun to assert itself as a political force in the Frémont campaign of the preceding year, and which Republican leaders had astutely encouraged. They now did so more than ever.

One result of this financial catastrophe was the indefinite postponement of a general Northern disunion convention at Cleveland, Ohio, in October.[2] Nearly seven thousand persons had signed a call for this assemblage,[3] which was to be like that held at Worcester, Massachusetts, in mid-winter, but representative of extreme radical sentiment of the whole North. Thus the Republicans were saved from a sharper embarrassment than that of the New England gathering, and Republican papers now assailed the Northern secession project in unsparing terms — it was as small in numbers as it was treasonable in purpose, they said. This, indeed, was true.[4]

[1] 'Such is the situation of New York at the present moment, her streets filled with proletarian bands, clamoring that the city government shall furnish them with bread or work, or threatening openly to resort to violence and plunder.' *Alexandria Gazette*, Nov. 9, 10, 13, 1857. The number of unemployed in danger of semi-starvation 'is almost inconceivable by those who have means.' New York *Tribune*, Oct. 22, 1857.

From Oct. to Dec., 1857, the New York press gave extended and detailed accounts of the desperate industrial situation and labor demonstrations in that city. Some papers said that conditions were like those preceding the French Revolution.

[2] The announcement, signed by Higginson, Phillips, and Garrison, said that the convention must be postponed because of the 'sudden paralytic shock which has fallen upon the whole country, in regard to its financial and business operations.' *Liberator*, Oct. 23, 1857. The postponement aroused great anger among Northern disunionists, resolutions denouncing those who called off the meeting were passed, and Parker Pillsbury wrote an abusive letter to Garrison. *Ib.*, Nov. 6, 1857.

[3] *Liberator*, Oct. 16, 1857. From Sept. 11, 1857, until it printed the notice that the convention must be put off, the *Liberator* urged that it be largely attended.

[4] When the call for the disunion convention was published in Sept., 1857, the *Chicago Tribune* denounced it in a very long and remarkable editorial: 'Acknowledging for the most part the justness of the complaints of the signers of the call, we are utterly and totally opposed to the . . . remedy . . . they recommend. They are Abolitionists; we are Republicans.' They think slavery the sole evil; we think it 'only one of the *incubi* by which the country is ridden. . . . Had we the power to turn loose, instantaneously, upon

But the panic gave the new party more positive help — the opportunity to assert that a protective tariff was necessary to avert such disasters, and to make that policy a basic feature of the Republican creed, now undergoing revision. Many causes had brought on the catastrophe — inflation of values by the floods of gold poured out from California mines, mad speculation in lands, railways, and other projects, attempts to carry out bloated plans for internal improvements, above all fantastic expansion of uncontrolled issues of currency by hundreds of irresponsible banks. But there had been heavy buying of foreign goods, too, and these importations had created large indebtedness to Europe.

While most economists said that the causes named, and especially the deranged currency, were the chief sources of trouble,[1]

the country, every bondman held in chains, we should not dare to pronounce them free. . . . We believe that he is unfit for the freedom that is our's' and that emancipation, without preparatory training, 'would be a crime in the master and a curse to the slave.' Because of slavery 'they [Abolitionists] hate the Union, and would break it up forever: . . . We love it, and would preserve it, because by its strength and the sacred principles upon which it is based, Slavery by and by will be impossible. . . . The shame of an attempt to overturn the Government . . . ought to have been left to the Nullifiers and fire-eaters of the South and their confederate traitors of the North,' etc. *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Sept. 29, 1857.

This was typical of Northern Republican editorials. At Springfield, Lincoln's paper declared: 'The only sympathizers such a convention of traitors have, are among the Southern wing of the . . . bogus Democratic party.' *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Nov. 2, 1857.

Conservative Southern papers were even more severe on the proposed disunion convention. 'We are not *advocates* of *Lynch* law, at any time or place, but — were there no true hearted American citizens in Cleveland, to drive these incendiaries out of their city?' asked the *Alexandria* (Va.) *Gazette*, Oct. 31, 1857, after printing a dispatch of what was done by many delegates who had gone to Cleveland in spite of the postponement of the convention.

[1] *Hunt's Merchants Magazine* for Oct. and Nov., 1857, contains careful articles on the panic, mostly by bankers and business men. One by Daniel R. Hundley of Chicago is on commercial and industrial failures in Illinois and the West, Oct., 1857, XXXVII, 444–5. Before the crash, borrowed money brought from three to five per cent interest per month.

Some Illinois Republican officeholders thought currency inflation the cause: 'It is better for us to know at once the end of all this *Bogus* Banking than to be tampering with a set of Insolvent Banks.' Jesse K. Dubois to Trumbull, Springfield, Oct. 5, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

In general, this was the view taken by the press: 'The great fountain of these causes [stock inflation, land speculation, etc.] is the expansion of the currency.' *New York Herald*, Sept. 28, 1857.

In a long and able editorial, the *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican*, Aug. 28, 1857, blamed speculation.

And see *Economic Essays:* Charles Franklin Dunbar, 266–93. Professor Dunbar at-

Seward and the Republican leaders laid the principal blame on the low tariff, and demanded a higher one [1] that would protect American industry and keep our money at home.[2] This was good old Whig doctrine, and, as we shall see, was a strong inducement to old line Whigs to join the new party in spite of its 'sectionalism.' The protective tariff plea was even more persuasive to great numbers of Democrats in the manufacturing States, particularly in Pennsylvania; and largely for this reason, we shall presently see them leave the Democratic Party in shoals and vote the Republican ticket in 1858 and for Lincoln in 1860.

Finally came the split in the Democratic Party. When the panic was at its worst, the Kansas problem was again thrust upon the new Administration. The subject produced upon Buchanan's mind, and, as he thought, upon the minds of most people, the same weary impatience with which the reader of these pages receives renewed mention of it.[3] Yet, since it caused Douglas to break with the President, and thus split his party, we must briefly review that disruption and the causes that produced it. Indeed, but for Douglas's defiance of the Administration and Democratic leaders, it is by no means certain that the debates between him and Lincoln would have been held.

The conflict in Kansas had now become one of parties striving for power and for the political and economic advantages that went with it.[4] The old Free-State Party was now the Republican Party, the old Law and Order Party was now the National Democratic Party. Nobody longer expected to make Kansas a

tributes the panic chiefly to the increase of gold, currency expansion, and railway exploitation.

[1] Greeley in New York *Tribune*, Nov. 5, 1857.

[2] *Chicago Daily Times*, Nov. 11, 1857, editorial on Seward's tariff speech.

[3] 'The Public is tired even *ad nauseam* with the Kansas agitation.' Buchanan to Governor James W. Denver, March 27, 1858. Moore, x, 200–2.

The President had long been disgusted with the subject. 'This Kansas question is one of the most absurd of all the Proteus-like forms which abolition fanaticism has ever assumed to divide and distract the country. And why do I say this? Kansas might enter the Union with a free constitution to-day, and once admitted, no human power known to the Constitution could prevent her establishing slavery tomorrow.' Buchanan's speech at Wheatland, Nov. 6, 1856. *Ib.*, 96–8.

This was the main point Buchanan made for the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution — once a State, Kansas could change her Constitution at any time.

[4] Location of the capital, penitentiary, and other State institutions, control of public

slave State permanently.[1] The majority against it was very great and rapidly increasing. Even Atchison and Stringfellow had given up. In Missouri itself leaders of both parties thought the institution was dying out in that State.[2] Climate alone made it impracticable in Kansas — 'incessant and tremendous winds from the icy Rocky Mountains' swept across the prairies, fuel was scarce.[3]

In this situation a Constitution was framed under which admission of Kansas as a State was sought. This instrument was the famous Lecompton Constitution, so called because the Convention making it met at the Territorial capital. It was wholly the work of the old pro-slavery men, because the Free-State men, or Republicans, had refused to take part in the election of delegates to the Constitutional Convention. The Free-State Party claimed that in half of the counties no census had been taken or registration made, without which electors in

offices and expenditures, establishment of railways and other corporations, the disposal of public lands, and, in general, the advantages and opportunities that go with power over legislation and administration.

A comparative study of acts passed by the 'bogus' Legislature of 1857 and those immediately enacted by the so-called Free-State Legislature of 1858 that speedily succeeded it is instructive. For instance, the incorporators of various railway companies under the first always included only Democratic, and those under the second solely Republican leaders. Laws relating to education, courts, and civil administration were not radically different.

[1] 'We have never thought Kansas would be a slave State.' *Richmond Enquirer*, Feb. 2, 1858.

'It was universally conceded that it could not be made a slave State by a fair vote of the people.' Testimony of Governor Robert J. Walker, Apr. 18, 1860. *Covode Investigation*, 107.

'Nobody thinks of making Kansas a slave State. The only question is shall it be a national democratic or an abolition State.' George A. Crawford, Bement, Ill., to Horatio King, July 13, 1857. King MSS., and in Connelley, *Miss. Vall. Hist. Rev.*, XIII, 541–4. Crawford had just been in Kansas making land investments, and his letter throws light on the economics and political situation there.

[2] Edward Everett, at St. Louis, to Robert C. Winthrop, at Boston, April 11, 1857. Winthrop MSS. 'I have seen Bates, [Senator] Geyer and the leaders of both parties here, and they all agree that slavery will not last long in this State.'

[3] Testimony Gov. Walker, *Covode Investigation*, 116. 'The permanent existence of slavery here [Kansas] is then preposterous; and I never heard but one pro-slavery man in Kansas who did not concede the fact. . . . The number of slaves in Kansas is, probably, about two hundred, it being estimated that two hundred have been taken away since the last severe winter.'

Justice McLean of the Supreme Court told Browning that James L. Orr, of South Carolina, Speaker of the House, 'is in favor of making Kansas a free State.' Browning's *Diary*, I, 294–5.

those counties could not vote. A far stronger reason, however, was the determination of the Republican leaders to preserve the alignment and discipline of their party, which, they argued, would be broken if they recognized in any way the authority of the fraudulent Legislature, which, from the first, they had consistently denounced and fought.[1]

The Democrats made answer that the taking of a census and the registration of voters were forcibly prevented in those very counties from which complaints now came, and in this there was some truth.[2] With more reason they also charged the partisan motive. At an election of a Legislature soon afterward many Free-State men did vote, however, and a heavy Republican majority resulted; but this was overcome by returns from two places where such enormous and open frauds were perpetrated that the new Governor, Robert J. Walker, himself a pro-slavery man, refused certificates to those shown thus to be elected.

Even the small participation of the Free-State men in this election showed that the Republicans vastly outnumbered their opponents in Kansas. It is a mathematical certainty that, had they voted for delegates to the Constitutional Convention, that body would have been almost unanimously Republican, and Kansas made a free State; but the Republicans would have been left without the advantage given them by the political storm we are now to witness.

So although the Constitutional Convention had been almost solidly pro-slavery, a hard fight, lasting for weeks, was made for a full submission of the proposed Constitution to the people. This fight was led by John Calhoun, Lincoln's old friend, employer, and counsellor in the New Salem days, who at Douglas's request had been appointed Surveyor General of the Territory,[3] and for the same reason was kept in that office by the new Governor.[4] Calhoun was an ardent pro-slavery man when in

[1] Some Eastern Republican leaders opposed this course. Senator Wilson of Massachusetts went to Kansas and begged the Republicans to vote. Wilson, II, 537–8.

[2] Speech of Senator Green of Missouri in Senate, March 1, 1858; *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. I, 905.

[3] *Douglas*, Johnson, 327.

[4] Walker's testimony, Apr. 18, 1860, *Covode Investigation*, 111.

the Illinois Legislature with Lincoln, and still held the same views; but when a candidate for the Constitutional Convention, he had promised to favor submission. He now kept his word and made the strongest speech of the Convention to that effect. The fight was lost, however, by a single vote.[1] After another bitter struggle and by a majority of but two votes [2] a compromise was adopted.

By this compromise the single question of slavery or no slavery was to be submitted to the people at an election to be held, December 21, 1857; but on no other part of the proposed Constitution were the people to vote. One clause thus kept from popular consideration provided that the property rights of the few slave-holders already in Kansas should not be taken away by any future legislation of the new State.[3]

Calhoun hesitated to accept the adjustment, but finally agreed and led the fight for it as he had for the 'out-and-out plan.' He did this largely because he thought it would please Douglas.[4] As President of the Convention, Calhoun transmitted the Constitution so modified to Washington, and thus, next to the President, became the main target for the shafts of anti-Lecompton men. For this there was some excuse, since Calhoun sent the document to Buchanan instead of to Congress, as the Convention had directed him to do.

It was over this question of partial submission of the Constitution for approval by the people at the polls that Douglas broke with the President and his party. Douglas insisted that the principle of popular sovereignty required that the people should be given the chance to vote on the whole Constitution and not on the one question of slavery alone; Buchanan and the party leaders felt that submission at that time was not wise as a practical matter, nor required as a matter of law. But

[1] Testimony of H. L. Martin before Covode Committee, May 9, 1860. *Ib.*, 161–3.

[2] *Ib.*, and Buchanan's Kansas Message, Feb. 2, 1858. *Messages:* Richardson, v, 471–81.

[3] For Lecompton Constitution see *Federal and State Constitutions:* Francis Newton Thorpe, II, 1201–20. This volume also contains the Topeka (Free-State) Constitution of 1855 and that of 1859 under which Kansas was admitted into the Union. All these constitutions are much alike, except in the article on slavery in the Lecompton Constitution, and in the provision in the Topeka Free-State Constitution of 1855, that only whites and Indians could vote, thus excluding free negroes.

[4] *Covode Investigation:* 162–70.

when the President had appointed a new Governor for Kansas, Douglas had, in May, 1857, told him on the way to his post, that he would support the then proposed constitution only if he were convinced that it was the will of the people; and he stuck now to what he had said then.[1]

Unless he acted on principle,[2] it is hard to see why Douglas took this grave step. On the sole ground of political expediency the weight of argument was with the President. The Lecompton Constitution was republican in form, as required by the National Constitution, and it had been framed by orderly and regular processes of law; many States had come into the Union without the people voting upon their Constitutions; the slavery question was the only one that had caused trouble, and that subject was to be decided at the polls; above all, once a State, the people could change their fundamental law if they did not like it, and thus there was no quicker way to settle the disturbance than for Congress to accept any Constitution presented.[3]

Such was the reasoning by which the President justified his championship of the Lecompton Constitution. His wish and purpose were to get the irritating subject of Kansas out of the way and prevent a recrudescence of strife and bloodshed in that Territory.[4] Forbidding reports of threatened hostilities there filled the air, and violence seemed likely to break out unless speedy action was taken.[5] If fighting did begin once more, the Nation would again be torn by sectional and partisan conten-

[1] Stevens, 515. [2] *Douglas:* Johnson, 333–5.

[3] Much was made of this point by the Administration press and by Democratic Senators throughout the debate. See especially *Washington Union*, Feb. 3, 1858; and Senator Brown's speech, Feb. 4, 1858. *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. 1, 572–3.

[4] This was the general Democratic and conservative view. 'The Kansas question has given trouble enough to the country; and we heartily hope that the Lecompton Constitution will be received by Congress, and the controversy brought to an end. If the people of Kansas are really dissatisfied with it, let them call a State Convention and remodel their organic laws.' *Richmond Enquirer*, Feb. 2, 1858.

[5] 'Civil war may rage there again with redoubled rancor.' *Ib.*, Feb. 9, 1858.

Governor Walker testified before the Covode Committee, April 18, 1860, that in 1857 the Topeka Party (Republicans) had 8,000 troops armed and drilled. *Covode Investigation*, 107. And see 'Order No. 2, Quartermaster's Department, Kansas Volunteers . . . Lawrence, Oct 19, 1857,' approved by 'J. H. Lane organizer,' in Library of Congress.

Absurd stories were printed about popular uprisings against the U.S. troops in Kansas, and tales about fights between Free-State men and the Border Ruffians were renewed. Kansas Correspondence, New York *Tribune*, Jan. 5, 8, 1858, *et seq.*

tion, and the Republican Party thus be given another access to that source of strength which had created it, and of which it was now so badly in need.[1] From the very beginning, moreover, the Democratic Party had vigorously claimed that the Free-State Party, now Republicans, were lawless and revolutionary and bent upon the overthrow of the regular and legal Government of the Territory. Also the President was convinced that if Kansas was not admitted now she could not be brought into the Union for a long time to come.[2]

The President himself appears to have formed his policy; no evidence has been adduced to support the charge that he yielded to Southern influence, or that that mysterious power was brought to bear upon him. Certainly the South had little to gain as a practical matter, since it was admitted on all hands that Kansas could not be kept a slave State for long.[3] But some Southern men seemed to think it vital to Southern interests that the Territory must come in as such.[4] For years, one free and one slave State had been admitted at about the same time,

[1] Of the large quantity of material on the President's views and his reasons for them, the best statements are those of Buchanan himself, in the Kansas part of his first annual message to Congress, Dec. 8, 1857. *Messages:* Richardson, v, 449–54, and his Kansas Message, Feb. 2, 1858. *Ib.*, 471–81.

[2] Buchanan to Denver, March 27, 1858. Moore, x, 200–2.

[3] A sensible and, for the time, remarkably accurate statement of Buchanan's predicament and Southern influence upon him was made by Chief Justice John Dean Caton of the Supreme Court of Illinois in a friendly letter of rebuke to Trumbull:

'I do not think that he [Buchanan] or any sane man on earth thinks that all the presidents and all the Cabinets and all the Congresses and all the supreme courts and all slaveholders on earth with all the constitutions which could be drawn can ever make Kansas a slave state.

'No there has been no such expectation, and I do not believe desire on the part of the president to make it a slave State; but as he had already been pestered to death with it, he resolved to make it a state as soon as possible, and thus being rid of it, let them fight it out as they liked. He could then cry "Go it husband! Go it bear!!"

'In this mood the southern members of the cabinet and others found him. When news of the constitution being formed came, he committed himself, thinking no doubt that Douglas would be hot for it and that there would be no general opposition in his own party to it.'

Trumbull had written to the Chief Justice that the slave trade would soon be set up in the free States if the Democratic Party stayed in power. Nonsense! retorted Caton; such talk was either stupid or sheer politics. 'Come and spend a while with me and I will make a rational and sober man of you again.' J. D. Caton to Trumbull, Jan. 27, 1858. Trumbull MSS. Caton was a Douglas Democrat.

[4] If not, '*the cause of southern rights is dead.*' Thos. W. Thomas, Elberon, Ga., to Stephens, Jan. 12, 1857. *Rept. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1911, II, 392. Italics Thomas's.

and Minnesota was even now knocking at the doors of Congress; California had been 'hurried' in solely because she had a free Constitution and was Kansas now to be kept out solely for the opposite reason? [1] To admit her might give two pro-slavery Senators for the time being at least — such appears to have been the curious reasoning of Southern extremists. Without much practical consideration they seemed to have looked on the matter as one of abstract principle.

To be sure, Southern statesmanship was then looking to the acquisition of Cuba, Mexico, and Central America — an almost traditional American purpose and hope — and expected to extend slavery over those vast regions; but, while the admission of Kansas as a slave State would keep up the custom of joint admission of free and slave States, that fact had little more than academic interest. All the territories then belonging to the United States were sure to become free States, and if the countries to the southward ever were annexed, they were just as sure to go for slavery. Yet many leading Southern men thought that the rejection of the Lecompton Constitution meant that no slave State ever would be admitted even in that tropical domain, and the President thought so too.[2]

But the South was by no means solid for the Lecompton Constitution. Most old line Whigs and Americans of that section were against it and many Democrats, even some leading fire-eaters, demanded that the entire Kansas Constitution, and not merely the slavery clause, should be submitted to the people. Of these Governor Wise of Virginia was as bold and outspoken as Douglas himself.[3] Several Southern papers took the same stand.[4] 'We expect to break into the south and get a number

[1] 'Are we of the South to be made to see California hurried into the Union against all law and all precedent, *because she is a free state*, and Kansas subjected to the rigors of the inquisition, because she *has a chance* of being a slave State?' Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Oxford, Miss., to Cobb, July 17, 1857. *Ib.*, 405–6.

[2] Buchanan to Denver, March 27, 1858. Moore, x, 200–2.

[3] Dec. 30, 1857, Wise wrote an elaborate and characteristic letter to Tammany Hall against the President's plan and for full submission of the Constitution. *Richmond Enquirer*, Jan 12, 1858; *Illinois Daily State Register*, Jan. 16, 1858. But the Legislature of Virginia passed resolutions for the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, and the *Washington Union* printed them in the same issue, Jan. 15, 1858, containing Wise's letter.

[4] *Richmond Enquirer*, Dec. 15, 1857.

of votes,' wrote the most trusted friend of Douglas in the House, when the excitement there was at its height.[1] Indeed, the fight against the Lecompton Constitution was begun by Governor Walker himself, a slave owner, former Senator from Mississippi and, at one time, the ablest and most successful politician in the South.

On the whole, however, leading men of the South insisted that Kansas should come in as a slave State, and, after the battle was joined, spoke out sharply.[2] The words 'principle' and 'justice' appear in all they said. Finally, Southern Legislatures began to pass resolutions looking to secession if the Lecompton plan should be beaten by the North.[3] It would appear that the people of the South, long infected with the idea that that section had often been 'wronged' by the North, became seriously excited. In Mississippi a young man of thirty-two, who, long after the war, was to become a United States Senator and an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Lucius Q. C. Lamar, was a candidate for Congress. He reported to Cobb that the whole people of his district were aroused.[4]

[1] Thomas L. Harris, Democratic Representative from the Springfield District, Washington, to Lanphier, editor *Illinois State Register*, Jan. 30, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[2] Even in Congress, Southern members regretted that the subject had been thrust upon them. The strongest anti-Lecompton and anti-Administration Democrat in the House, wrote to Lanphier:

'There is a bad state of feeling here [Washington] — worse than in 1850. The southern members most of them are much hurt at the turn things have taken. They are caught, and have been deceived, as have their people.' Harris to Lanphier, Feb. 10, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[3] 'If Kansas is rejected . . . the statute makes it my imperative duty to call the convention which must determine the *status* of Georgia with reference to the Union. . . . When the Union ceases to protect our equal rights, it ceases to have any charms for me.' Joseph E. Brown, Milledgeville, Ga., to Stephens, Feb. 9, 1858. *Rept. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1911, II, 431–2.

Cobb, who was for full submission but far more interested in the panic and its effect on 'the money market' than on Kansas ('I am run to the eyebrows'), feared drastic action by his State. 'Gov. Brown and our friends in the legislature ought to be warned not to make *hasty* and *unnecessary* issues.' Cobb, Washington, to Stephens, Oct. 9, 1857. *Ib.*, 424–5.

The Legislatures of Mississippi, Virginia, Alabama, Tennessee, California, and Texas demanded the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, and Alabama and Texas favored a Southern Convention if it was rejected; while some months later, Ohio, Michigan, Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Wisconsin, New Hampshire, and Vermont, declared against the Lecompton plan. *State Documents on Federal Relations*. Ames, VI, 59–60.

[4] Lamar to Cobb, July 17, 1857. *Rept. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1911, II, 405–6. This was not

Buchanan had been 'indifferent' as to the course Kansas might take, 'so it [the decision on slavery] was fairly and honestly made by the people of Kansas, and this was the position of every member of the cabinet.' [1] When the President adopted his program, however, his cabinet to a man supported him on the ground that acceptance of the Lecompton Constitution was the speediest way to dispose of the problem and give the country needed repose.[2] At first, the bulk of his party, North and South, also stood by the President.[3]

Had Douglas done so, too, there is small likelihood that any but Republican resistance would have been made to the President's plan, and it would have been adopted without much difficulty — with far less, at the worst, than had been the case in the fight led by the Little Giant to pass the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Douglas was, indeed, 'the very life and soul of this agitation,' said Senator Albert Gallatin Brown of Mississippi, with mournful bitterness; if he had stood by the President in doing his duty, 'there would not have been a ripple on the surface and we should almost without an effort introduce Kansas into the Union.' [4]

Nor were there signs that any such desperate popular strug-

at all because of objection to submitting the whole constitution to the people, however, but because of Governor Walker's reported 'threat to make such a course a *sine qua non* of admission [of Kansas] as a state into the Union.'

[1] Cobb, Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, to Stephens, June 18, 1857. 'Private.' *Ib.*, 402–3.

John B. Floyd, Va., Secretary of War, was '*for peace*' with Douglas, because he feared reprisals in some departmental affairs. Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, May 8, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

Jacob Thompson, Tennessee, Secretary of the Interior, strongly favored full submission, and he accepted the Lecompton compromise only when convinced that it was the best that could be obtained. Testimony of H. C. Martin, May 9, 1860, *Covode Investigation*, 165–8.

[2] Letters of members of Buchanan's Cabinet to Philadelphia Buchanan Committee, Dec., 1857. *New York Herald*, Dec. 31, 1857.

[3] The *Washington Union* (Administration organ), Nov. 21, 1857, *et seq.*, printed editorials in support of the President's Lecompton policy from Democratic papers all over the North, for instance: the *Pennsylvanian; New Haven* (Conn.) *Register; Brooklyn* (N.Y.) *Daily News; Providence* (R.I.) *Daily Post; New Lisbon* (Ohio) *Patriot; Trenton* (N.J.) *True American; Chillicothe* (Ohio) *Advertiser; Boston Ledger; Bridgeport* (Conn.) *Farmer; Philadelphia Argus; Lawrence* (Mass.) *Sentinel; Dubuque* (Ia.) *Northwest; Paterson* (N.J.) *Register; Maine Free Press; Rockland* (Me.) *Democrat; Salem* (Mass.) *Advocate, Buffalo* (N.Y.) *Republic, et omnes.* But the *Chicago Times*, Nov. 20, 1857, printed the names of as many Northern papers which had come out against the Lecompton plan.

[4] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. 1, 573. Feb. 4, 1858.

gle would ensue as that which had been waged by Douglas in the two preceding campaigns. On the contrary, Democratic prospects were bright. That party had just carried Wisconsin, and in town elections even in New England there had been heavy Democratic gains. If Douglas had fallen into line, he would have been at the head of a united and militant party of which he was the ablest member and the outstanding leader. Up to this moment, he had been the strictest disciplinarian in the Democratic organization.

But Douglas decided to take the other course and make war upon the program of the President and his party. Thus he became what is now called a party insurgent, the first great party insurgent in our history since John Randolph of Roanoke. And he well knew the political peril he was thus bringing upon himself.[1] The same thing has been done many times since with smaller excuse, and the retaliation by the President and party leaders, which we are now to witness, was not unlike that so often visited upon party dissenters. Indeed, the fight made upon Douglas presently developed the basic issue of freedom of judgment and action within the party by party members of Congress, as against their submission to any policy of a party President supported by the majority of party leaders and made a test of party fealty. Douglas also made mention of other projects, the Pacific Railroad, for instance, and asked whether no independent opinion was to be permitted on that vital subject? Of the party dissension thus created Lincoln, as a resourceful politician, is presently to take full advantage.

In making estimate of the causes that led Buchanan and Douglas to take a mutually hostile stand, it is not only fair but necessary to consider the state of mind of each man at that particular time. The mental attitude, even the physical condition of men in important stations, can never be left out of account in any just portrayal of what they did and why they did it.

The President was now nearly sixty-eight years of age. He had been brought up in the school of party autocracy. His first training in party leadership and regularity was under

[1] *Douglas:* Johnson, 335.

Jackson, who brooked no opposition, and he tried to imitate the methods of that party despot. As Chief Magistrate of the Nation, and, officially, the head of his party, he honestly and firmly believed that it was his duty to formulate party policies and exact — compel, if need be — party support of them. Moreover, he was an excellent lawyer, a public man of longer and wider experience than any living personage, except Cass; and he thought himself to be, and up to the very hour of his support of the Lecompton Constitution was considered by most people to be, a statesman. Buchanan's dearest wish was to dispose of the Kansas question forever, so that his Administration could attend to the tangle of situations, foreign and domestic, that pressed upon it, and the President expected and demanded the support of his party.

Douglas was almost a quarter of a century younger than Buchanan and, for the moment, in better health than he had been for a long time. He was master of his party in Illinois and his personal hold on Democrats everywhere, particularly in the North, was far stronger than that of any other man. Persuasive, magnetic, dominant, commanding, he was by nature a dictator. 'Here indeed was a lion, by the very look of him master of himself and of others,' wrote the wife of a member of the House who was opposing Douglas.[1] If any one was to lay down the law to his party, Douglas would do it himself, and he felt that he had earned the right to do it. Certainly he would not submit to dictation from a man with smaller personal influence than he himself had long exercised, especially dictation as to a policy which he had created and of which he considered himself to be the peculiar interpreter and champion. Moreover, it was the exertions of Douglas and they alone that had secured the electoral vote of Illinois for the Democratic candidate for President, had largely produced the same result in Indiana, and had helped mightily to bring about party victory in Pennsylvania.

'By G—d, sir, I made Mr. James Buchanan, and by G—d,

[1] *Reminiscences of Peace and War:* Mrs. Roger A. Pryor of Virginia, 66–7. Mrs. Pryor declares that Douglas was the 'most interesting, picturesque, and prominent' man in Washington.

sir, I will unmake him!' Douglas exclaimed in Chicago,[1] when, before Congress met, the President was reported as favoring the Lecompton Constitution and as inclining to make it a party policy and support of it a test of party fealty.

With a record of desperate political battles such as few men had fought in this country, and of an unbroken series of political victories such as few had won, Douglas had just achieved another triumph greater than any or all his successes in politics. A few weeks after Buchanan's election, the Illinois Senator had married the acknowledged belle of Washington. She was the famous Adele Cutts, tradition of whose beauty and charm is warm and vivid in the Nation's capital even to this day.[2]

During her reign many descriptions of her were written by all kinds of people, men and women, old and young; and in every one of them emphatic comment is made in extravagant words on her loveliness, bright intelligence, gentle manners,

[1] Charles H. Ray (editor *Chicago Press and Tribune*) to Trumbull, Chicago, Nov. 24, [1857]. Trumbull MSS. Douglas was quite open in saying in Chicago, that the entire Constitution of Kansas must be submitted to the people. O. M. Hatch to Trumbull, Springfield, Nov. 23, 1857. *Ib.*

[2] Douglas and Miss Cutts were married Nov. 20, 1856, by Father J. B. Byrne in the Roman Catholic Church at Washington, to which denomination she belonged. She had several bridesmaids, but Douglas 'being a widower, went alone.' Only Shields, Senator Slidell, and two or three other of Douglas's friends were present. *New York Evening Post* and *New York Mirror* of Nov. 21, 1856, clipped in *Chicago Journal*, Nov. 24, 1856.

Describing the bride, the *Post* correspondent said: 'Miss Cutts is tall, elegantly formed, with a sweet, oval face, large brown eyes, small Grecian forehead, around which are entwined the heavy braids of her glossy and abundant chestnut hair. On her clear, peachy complexion, there is a perpetual war of the roses — the red and the white — each failing to maintain sole supremacy.'

Her father was J. Madison Cutts, a nephew of Dolly Madison, who, for many years had been an official under the Second Comptroller of the Treasury, and was reputed to be an able, hard-working man but without political backing. Adele was much like her great aunt, was well educated and had 'more good strong common sense than any belle I ever knew.' Washington Correspondence, *New York Herald*, Nov. 19, in issue Nov. 21, 1856, which, under the caption, 'The Fiancée of Senator Douglas,' continues:

'The approaching marriage of Mr. Douglas with Miss Cutts is now the absorbing theme of conversation in fashionable and political circles. This lady is . . . a representative of the great Madison family and brings to Mr. Douglas the sympathies and social influences of her friends.'

The honeymoon was spent in Philadelphia, New York, and other cities. 'He is enjoying himself in the two-fold capacity of a happy bridegroom and a rejoicing democrat.' *Ib.*, Nov. 26, 1856.

The *Pennsylvanian*, clipped in *Illinois Daily State Register*, Nov. 29, 1856, said: 'This wedding is an affair of unusual interest and excites the warmest wishes of a large circle of friends throughout the entire nation.'

kindness of heart.[1] Of especial interest is the fact that no woman appears to have been envious or even critical of her — all were her steadfast friends. Men were at her feet and she could have married whomever she pleased.

But when Adele Cutts was twenty-four years old, she became the wife of a man nearly twenty years her senior, and a widower with two children. Stranger still, since the death of his first wife, four years earlier, Douglas had become negligent of dress, reckless in habits, and had shunned fashionable society; yet he won the most attractive woman in Washington.

At once Douglas's house became the social and also political centre of the capital, more so even than the White House, notwithstanding the fact that Harriet Lane, Buchanan's niece, presided there.[2] Not long after the adjournment of Congress, Mrs. Douglas went with her husband to Chicago, and captivated that city, much to the disgust of the Republican State Chairman.[3] Even greater was her triumph at Springfield, on their visit to the State capital when Douglas made his speech there in June, 1857. Thus he was at the very summit of his amazing career, the undefeated champion in every field.

Such was the state of things and such the frame of mind of the two men at the time the break between Douglas and Buchanan came. When he returned to Washington for the fateful session of Congress of 1857–58,[4] Douglas's purpose was

[1] For example: 'Beautiful as a pearl, sunny-tempered, unselfish, warm-hearted, sincere.' Pryor, 69.

[2] 'Douglas had the grandest *fête* last night ever seen in Washington. Upwards of two thousand guests thronged from eight till four in the morning his extensive and elegant mansion. It was filled from basement to attic, and comforts and refreshments, wit, beauty, gallantry, and good feeling were seen everywhere.' A reception by the Secretary of State the same night was 'a most beggarly affair,' compared with that of Douglas. Thomas L. Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, Jan. 20 [1857]. Lanphier MSS.

'The House of Judge Douglas is as much frequented as the White House. Visitors from all parts of the country are anxious to get an introduction to the great champion of popular sovereignty.' Washington Correspondence, *Illinois Daily State Register*, March 15, 1858.

[3] Judd to Trumbull, Chicago, May 12, 1858, Trumbull MSS., telling of Senator and Mrs. Douglas's arrival and a party in their honor which Judd, though half sick, meant to attend just to see the 'flunking' — 'I'll be a thorn in their side if they do.'

[4] The editor of the *Chicago Journal* (Republican), Charles L. Wilson, wrote to Trumbull that Douglas was leaving Chicago for Washington to take up the fight against the Lecompton Constitution, and Wilson urged Trumbull to 'anticipate' him. Wilson to Trumbull, Nov. 26, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

The editor of the *Tribune*, Charles H. Ray, and the Republican State Chairman,

fixed. He made a call upon the President in order to discuss the situation. They could not agree. Both were determined, both dogmatic. At the end, Buchanan rose and, towering above Douglas, said with stern dignity:

'Mr. Douglas, I desire you to remember that no Democrat ever yet differed with an administration of his own choice without being crushed. Beware of the fate of Talmadge and Rives' — two men whom Jackson had broken for party insurgency.

'Mr. President,' Douglas answered in his deep, impressive voice, 'I wish you to remember that General Jackson is dead.' [1]

Head erect and eyes flashing, Douglas stalked out of the White House and the fight was on.[2] 'The Battle will soon begin,' Douglas informed his confidential friend, the editor of the party organ at Springfield. 'We will nail our colors to the mast and Defend the right of the people to govern themselves against all assaults from all quarters. . . . Keep the Ball rolling, and the Party united. It will be all right in the end.' [3]

The attack of Douglas was swift and bold. Seward, Wilson, and all Republicans in Senate and House cheered him on. The Republican press of the East was almost solid in its praise of the great Democrat. Greeley went to Washington, and 'scrabbling down Pennsylvania Avenue' looking 'like a Methodist exhorter from the interior of Vermont' [4] with his flapping white coat, broad-brimmed white hat, and fringe of gray hair, hurried to the Capitol to offer his counsel and encouragement to the man he had so long vilified.

Douglas's party friends in the Senate begged him to wait until after the voting upon the Constitution in Kansas, now only a few days off — perhaps the people would then reject the

Norman B. Judd, also insisted that Trumbull should take the lead. Judd to Trumbull, Dec. 1, 1857. So did the Republican Secretary of State and State Auditor, Hatch and Dubois, writing Trumbull at the same time, obviously in concert with the Chicago editors and State Chairman.

[1] *Douglas:* Johnson, 328; Stevens, 519.

[2] 'I have seen Douglas twice. He is against us. . . . He looks upon the [Lecompton Constitution] as a trick, etc. His course, I fear, will do us damage. The Administration say they will be firm. He and they will come into open hostility, I fear.' Stephens to his brother, Washington, Dec. 4, 1857. Johnston and Browne, 327.

[3] Douglas, Washington, to Lanphier, Dec. 6, 1857. 'Confidential.' Lanphier MSS.

[4] Washington Correspondence, *Chicago Daily Times*, Feb. 28, in issue March 4, 1858.

slavery clause. He refused — voting on that one point alone was not voting on the whole instrument, the remainder of which, under the Lecompton plan, must be accepted whether the people wanted it or not. Who was James Buchanan, who were Democratic Senators, who was anybody to tell him what the principle of local self-government meant, or what was his duty as a party man? With spirit and hauteur, he declined to placate his foes.[1]

'I have taken a through ticket, and checked all my baggage,' Douglas told the President in another interview, when Buchanan again asked him whether he realized where he was going.[2]

None but lurid adjectives can describe the anger of most Democratic Senators. Those from the North were even more wrathful than those from the South. Douglas carried with him only three, two of them young men [3] and even one of these was faint of heart and went back to the party fold.[4] No matter — Douglas had started and would go through to the end. Washington hummed with excited talk. No such sensation had taken place in years.

When on December 9, 1857, the very day after the President's annual message had been read, Douglas rose in the Senate to make his attack, floor, aisles, galleries, and corridors were crowded. The scene was like that when Webster made his Seventh of March Speech nearly eight years before. Everybody in Washington had learned that the great Democratic leader from Illinois would challenge the Administration and its supporters, and everybody was there to see and hear him do it.[5] In the front row of the Senate gallery were Mrs. Douglas and her mother.[6]

[1] *Douglas:* Johnson, 334. [2] *Recollections of a Busy Life:* Horace Greeley, 356.

[3] Senator David Colbreth Broderick of California, thirty-nine years old; Senator George Ellis Pugh of Ohio, thirty-five years old; and Senator Charles E. Stuart of Michigan, forty-seven years old.

[4] Pugh.

[5] *Trumbull:* White, 77; Sheahan, 320.

'There never was such anxiety to see Douglas before. The president is on thorns. . . . Douglas will make the greatest effort of his life in opposition to the juggle.' Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, Dec. 3, 1857. Lanphier MSS.

[6] *Baltimore Republican,* in *Chicago Daily Times,* Dec. 16, 1857. This issue also gives editorials from many papers laudatory of Douglas's speech.

Douglas was in fine form, and spoke with unwonted moderation of manner. His argument was an exposition of the principle of popular sovereignty, made with that lucidity characteristic of all his speeches — the fundamental right of the people to pass upon the entire Constitution, 'each and every clause of it.' Yet by the Lecompton scheme, the people had to vote *for* it, no matter how they might vote on the slavery clause. For the 'Constitution with slavery or constitution with no slavery' — those were the only ballots that could be cast! It was, said Douglas, like Napoleon's idea of a fair and free election of himself as First Consul, as described by his enemies: 'Now my soldiers, you are to go to the election and vote freely, just as you please. If you vote for Napoleon, all is well; vote against him, and you are to be instantly shot.'

Douglas, himself, did not like some parts of the Constitution, he said, but if the people wanted them, that was their affair, not his. The people had the right to vote for or against them, as well as for or against slavery. Why except that subject only? 'You have no more right to force a free-State constitution on Kansas than a slave-State constitution. . . . It is none of my business which way the slavery clause is decided. I care not whether it be voted down or voted up. . . . I take it for granted that it will be voted out.' [1]

Angry and sullen, the Democratic Senators sat glowering. But the Democracy of the Northwest responded to the Douglas call; great public meetings were held in approval of his stand.[2] The Indiana Democratic State Convention, controlled by the Indiana Administration Senators and the State machine, and influenced by a young orator of great power, Daniel W. Voorhees of Terre Haute, was about to declare against Douglas, but swung to him amid tumultuous scenes when another young Democrat, Lew Wallace of Montgomery County, offered a Douglas resolution and supported it in a fiery speech.[3]

Twelve days after Douglas hurled his defiance the Kansas

[1] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. I, 14–8.

[2] Stevens, 526, *Chicago Times*, Jan. 5, 1858.

[3] *Chicago Daily Times*, Jan. 10, 12, 13, 1858; *Illinois Daily State Register*, Jan. 13, 1858.

election on the Lecompton Constitution was held.[1] Again the Free-State Party, as such, refused to vote and in some places forcibly kept pro-slavery men from the ballot-box.[2] So a comparatively small vote was polled, but it was, of course, almost a unit for slavery.[3] Yet a fortnight later,[4] the Republicans changed their tactics and voted solidly at an election for Legislative and other offices under the very Constitution they had refused to recognize, and an overwhelming Republican majority of the Legislature [5] was chosen in spite of heavy frauds, and went into office without any trouble or dispute.

At this election, too, the Republicans voted on the Lecompton Constitution, without authority of law, and rejected it by more than ten thousand majority, pro-slavery men almost unanimously refusing to vote, of course.[6] 'We are now rid of *open* interference from the Democratic party of this territory,' a Kansas Republican manager reported to Senator Hale in Washington. 'We have virtually settled the issue *here* between slavery and freedom, but the last Election against the Constitution and for State officers has given us the entire control.' [7] Practical and wily men were the politicians of Kansas on both sides.

In such fashion did partisan manœuvres on both sides render the politics of the time 'unintelligible,' as George Ticknor of Boston expressed it to an English friend.[8] As soon as the Lecompton Constitution thus became a slavery instrument, John Calhoun, as President of the Constitutional Convention, sent

[1] Dec. 21, 1857.

[2] Leavenworth Correspondence, *New York Herald*, Dec. 21, 1857, in issue Jan. 4, 1858.

[3] 6143 to 589. [4] Jan. 4, 1858.

[5] House, twenty-nine to fifteen; Senate, thirteen to six.

[6] See *Reminiscences of Gov. Robert J. Walker:* Geo. W. Brown, 143–5.

[7] J. W. Robinson, Manhattan, Riley Co., Kansas to John P. Hale, Feb. 5, 1858. Hale MSS. N.H. Hist. Socy., Concord, N.H. This vitally important letter reveals political conditions in Kansas and the purely political devices of both parties.

[8] Ticknor, Boston, to Sir Charles Lyell, Feb. 19, 1858. *Ticknor:* Curtis, II, 407–8. 'Our politics are in a state of great confusion. . . . The reason is that the old parties are breaking up and the new ones are not sufficiently formed to be intelligible. The great contest, as you know, is about Kansas. Buchanan has behaved as badly as possible about it; the leaders of the Free Soil party no better. Both have treated it as a game for political power. It has been just as certain for nearly two years, as it is now admitted to be by everybody, that Kansas will be a free state; and yet, as each party has believed that it could profit more by contest than its adversary could, the contest has been continued. Either party could have stopped it at any time during the last two years.'

it to Buchanan. Promptly the President transmitted it to Congress together with his famous Kansas message, giving the arguments already stated.[1]

All knew, of course, what the Kansas message would be. Although ill, Douglas prepared for renewed war. 'When the message comes, hold your breath. Douglas will shake the capitol and the country,' the devoted Harris advised Lanphier.[2] The Republican press of the East, led by Greeley, lauded Douglas.[3] 'Had the administration followed the lead of Douglas and Walker, the republican organization would have broken to pieces at once,' declared the cautious *Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican*.[4] Thus the struggle was precipitated beyond recall. The President and the party must fight or yield. They fought. Only those who have seen the strange malignity of party hatred in such cases, can realize the violence of abuse with which Douglas was lashed.

The organ of the Administration, the *Washington Union*, now run by the Public Printer, Cornelius Wendell, one of the most corrupt men in political history, read Douglas out of the party, and that paper continued to berate him throughout his campaign for the Senate, which we are now to review.[5] The President treated him as a party rebel and used the club of patronage to beat him down. All over Illinois and in Washington, Douglas men in office were discharged and Buchanan men

[1] Special Message, Feb. 2, 1858. *Messages:* Richardson, v, 471–81.

The President gave a succinct account of Kansas troubles, laid great emphasis upon the fact that 'the speedy admission of Kansas . . . would restore peace and quiet to the country,' and that the people of Kansas could change the Constitution at once, if they did not like it. Buchanan's appeal was not without pathos:

'I have thus performed my duty on this important question, under a deep sense of responsibility to God and my country. My public life will terminate within a brief period, and I have no other object of earthly ambition than to leave my country in a peaceful and prosperous condition and to live in the affections and respect of my countrymen.' *Ib.*, 481.

But speaking as a lawyer only, and with utter lack of the politician's skill, and perhaps to reassure the restless South, the President made use of a sentence that became a very dagger in the hands of his enemies: 'Kansas is therefore at this moment as much a slave state as Georgia or South Carolina.' *Ib.*, 479.

[2] Washington, Jan. 30, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[3] Long editorials New York *Tribune*, Dec. 21, 23, 1857.

[4] Dec. 10, 1857. Editorial, and also Douglas's speech in full.

[5] Dec. 23, 1857, full page editorial.

— regular Democrats — appointed to their places.[1] Democratic leaders, ambitious for the Presidency and eager to get Douglas out of the way, sided with the Administration. Throughout the country, Democratic newspapers that had been well-nigh Douglas organs turned against him. 'Kill him off,' exclaimed the *Indianapolis Sentinel*.[2]

But not for a moment did Douglas quail. Neither a long illness[3] nor that of his wife, who came near dying,[4] shook him. He rose from his sick-bed to close the debate. Although his voice was so feeble that at times he could scarcely be heard, he spoke for three hours at night, clear, firm, defiant to the last. The Senate Chamber, galleries, and all approaches were so jammed that men fought to get near, and correspondents could not reach the places assigned to the press.

'Neither the frowns of power nor the influences of patronage will change my action, or drive me from my principles,' said Douglas solemnly and with all the strength he could muster. 'I prefer private life, preserving my own self-respect and manhood, to abject and servile submission to executive will.'[5] Exhausted, he sank into his chair. His repeated declaration of independence angered his party associates and the Administration more than ever; but it had a tremendous effect upon Republicans of the East.[6]

[1] Herndon to Parker, Feb. 20, 1858; Newton, 141–3.

[2] In *Chicago Daily Times*, Jan. 6, 1858.

[3] 'Douglas is sick, quite so, but say nothing of it. He is a little better today. Jeff Davis is used up for the session.' Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, March 13, and 11, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

Davis was 'confined to a darkened room with serious inflammation of the eyes. He will not be out for two months at least,' and could not take part in the Lecompton debate. Washington Correspondence, *Illinois Daily State Register*, March 15, 1858.

[4] 'A cloud has hung over the society of the Capital . . . on account of the illness of Mrs. Senator Douglas, who is one of its chief ornaments. . . . It was even rumored that the death-angel had a second time visited the Illinois Senator's mansion and withdrawn HER who had just emerged into the light of her new and distinguished career, and proved herself so worthy of it by triumphs oft repeated and dazzling. . . . The society of the Capital could ill afford to dispense with her, its bright particular star. . . . The sudden and dangerous illness of Senator Douglas' lady has shown what a hold she has upon the hearts of the brilliant circle, in which she moves here like a Queen. The regret and anxiety on her account has been universal.' Washington Correspondence, *Chicago Daily Times*, Feb. 15, in issue Feb. 23, 1858.

[5] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, 201, March 22, 1858.

[6] Newton, 152. A summary of this remarkable speech was published, and the dra-

Non-partisan and conservative papers of the North, however, took Buchanan's side. As a practical matter the Lecompton Constitution amounted to nothing, they said, and the admission of Kansas under it would end the trouble, since the Free-State men could and would immediately change it.[1] War was likely to break out again in Kansas, for Lane was once more on the scene; the only way out was for Congress to admit Kansas without delay.[2] Settle the matter and give the country peace.

The telegraph carried to Springfield and all over Illinois the news of every incident in the progress of the fight. Republicans rejoiced.[3] The junior partner was gleeful. This was the end of Douglas, Herndon wrote to Theodore Parker. The war between them is fierce, fiery, full of hate. 'The Buchanan faction here will kill him for the Senatorial seat.'[4] Splendid! answered the radical Boston preacher in a very long letter about the plans and motives of Douglas; he was the 'bloodhound of the South,' but was now 'biting our enemies;' let them fight it out! 'Dog eat dog . . . bite 'em, take hold on 'em, stibboy!'[5]

Judd, Chairman of the Republican State Committee, hurried to Washington and on his return conferred with Lincoln in Chicago. The President would soon organize Illinois democracy against the insurgent. 'Douglas is dead,' he reported, and 'knows he is lost'[6] — so dead, indeed, 'that even the Republicans cannot save him.'[7] Friends of Douglas whom Herndon saw, 'curse strongly — and "drink heap whiskey,"' he informed Parker. Good! Let 'the devils "chaw" the bitter cud.'[8] The Republican press and all good party men egged on the warring Democratic factions — 'we want to make it [the split] wider and deeper — hotter and more impassable.'[9]

matic scenes of the night described, in the New York *Tribune*, March 24, 1858, and in most Eastern papers, and in sections by the *Illinois Daily State Register*, April 14, 15, 16, 1858.

[1] *New York Herald*, Jan. 2, 1858, *et seq.* [2] New York *Times*, Dec. 15, 1857.

[3] W. H. Gardner, Lee Center, Ill., Dec. 24, 1857, to Trumbull. Trumbull MSS.

[4] Herndon to Parker, Dec. 19, 1857. Newton, 133–4.

[5] Parker to Herndon, Dec. 31, 1857. *Ib.*, 137–9.

[6] Herndon to Parker, Feb. 20, 1858. *Ib.*, 143, quoting Judd.

[7] *Ottawa Weekly Republican*, March 8, 1858.

[8] Herndon to Parker, Feb. 20, 1858. Newton, 143.

[9] Herndon to Trumbull, Springfield, Feb. 19, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

But doubts soon began to subdue this cheery mood. Lincoln never had been so sanguine as his buoyant partner. 'Nearly all the Democrats here stick to Douglas,' he wrote to Trumbull a few days after Douglas's first speech; 'but they are hobbling along with the idea that there is no split between him and Buchanan.' Won't Trumbull give Lincoln his views? [1] How Lincoln did hang on, sneered a Democratic organ: 'Hon. Abe Lincoln is undoubtedly the most unfortunate politician that has ever attempted to rise in Illinois. In everything he undertakes, politically, he seems doomed to failure. He has been prostrated often enough in his political schemes to have crushed the life out of any ordinary man.' [2]

Praise of Douglas by the Eastern Republican press annoyed Lincoln. 'What does the "New York Tribune" mean by its constant eulogising, and admiring, and magnifying Douglas?' Lincoln asked Trumbull in a letter written when Lincoln was on the circuit. 'Does it, in this, speak the sentiments of the Republicans at Washington? Have they concluded that the Republican cause, generally, can be best prompted [promoted] by sacrificing us here in Illinois? If so we would like to know it soon; it will save us a great deal of labor to surrender at once. As yet I have heard of no Republican here going over to Douglas; but if the "*Tribune*" continues to din his praises into the ears of its five or ten thousand Republican readers in Illinois, it is more than can be hoped that all will stand firm. I am not complaining — I only wish a fair understanding. Please write me at Springfield.' [3]

There was reason for Lincoln's gloomy forebodings. Republican leaders in the Senate were strong for Douglas. Henry Wilson was sure that he would even join the new party, 'and he is today of more weight to our cause than any other ten men in the country.' The Massachusetts Senator reported that in a long talk with several Republican Senators and Representatives, Douglas had said: 'We must grind this administration to powder.' 'Don't fear him,' wrote Wilson. 'He will sink the

[1] Lincoln to Trumbull, Dec. 18, 1857. Tracy, 83.

[2] *Our Constitution*, July 4, 1857.

[3] Lincoln to Trumbull, Bloomington, Ill., Dec. 28, 1857. Tracy, 83–4.

Democratic party.'[1] Greeley was clear and positive that Douglas had earned Republican support on merit and that sound party strategy required that it be given him; and the great editor never changed his mind.[2]

Herndon, however, could see nothing except disaster for Douglas;[3] but so strong ran the Administration current, that even the junior partner's rejoicing was soon checked. 'Desertions are too fast and quick from Douglas to Buchanan to do us much good,' he reported to Trumbull. It was so all through Central Illinois, he wrote, where old line Whigs who were against Frémont in 1856, were now flocking to the President and were '*hot*' against Douglas.[4] We shall presently see many of these Buchanan Democrats and Whigs vote the Republican ticket to make sure of beating Douglas.

The attitude of national Republican leaders and the party press of the East enraged Illinois Republicans. Douglas's stand was a mere trick they said — his reëlection was just ahead and his insurgency was only a measure to get votes next year; he

[1] Wilson to Parker, Feb. 28, 1858. Newton, 148.

[2] 'I still [1868] abide in that conviction.' Greeley, 357–8. Greeley adds that the Illinois Republicans said that Lincoln must be made Senator now because he had been beaten for that office before.

[3] Herndon to Parker, March 4, 1858. Newton, 150. Democratic leaders in Illinois 'are going over to Buchanan "thick and fast."'

[4] Herndon to Trumbull, Springfield, Feb. 27, 1858. Trumbull MSS. Nevertheless, Herndon said that 'we are quite enthusiastic here just now, and . . . the so-called [Douglas] democracy are down in the mouth.' *Ib.*, and same to same, Feb. 16, 1858.

'Douglas is certainly not gaining in this State. I have never yet seen *one* Republican who has gone to him.' Wm. H. Bissell (Gov. Ill.), Springfield, to Trumbull, Jan. 9, 1858. *Ib.*

'The Democrats have taken the Administration chute almost to a man. . . . We [Republicans] are all awake and all working thus early for some good Republican for the Senatorship.' John T. Knox, Pleasant Plains, Sangamon Co., Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 4, 1858. *Ib.*

'Our Douglas men are all badly down in the mouth. . . . Things are working finely for us in the next campaign.' Jeff. L. Dugger, Atlanta, Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 28, 1858. *Ib.*

Douglas's friends were 'most terribly disappointed.' O. M. Hatch (Republican Secretary of State), Springfield, Ill., to Trumbull, Feb. 6, 1858. *Ib.*

'I hear daily of men who are coming out for Buchanan and against Douglas — let a few removals be made and Lecompton anti-Douglas men will spring up like mushrooms.' A. Jonas, Quincy, Ill., to Trumbull, Feb. 13, 1858. *Ib.*

Douglas men were stronger against Buchanan than against the Republicans. Theo. H. Price, Ottawa, Ill., to Trumbull, Feb. 15, 1858. *Ib.*

'Few dare come out there [Macoupin Co.] and advocate Douglas against Buchanan while nearly half that party with a competent leader would declare for Buchanan against Douglas.' Jno. Trible, Alton, Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 13 1858. *Ib.*

knew that he could not win unless he about-faced, so strongly was sentiment running in Illinois against the Kansas fraud. They understood Douglas, they declared, and they refused to be caught in so plain a trap. Had they built up the Republican organization to let it thus be broken up now? [1] The editor of the most important Republican paper in the West suggested that if Douglas would join the new party openly, he might be given 'the hope of a place in the Cabinet of the next Republican President' — but for Senator! No! Lincoln must have that place if the Republicans should win.[2]

[1] The position of the Illinois Republicans was first publicly stated — and best stated — by Gustave Koerner in the St. Louis *Anzeiger des Westens*. It was copied in the *Illinois Staats-Zeitung*, and the *Chicago Tribune* published a translation of it. Koerner, II, 54–6. The whole Republican press said the same thing.

Carl Schurz continued to think all his life that 'It would thus have disgraced the virginity of the Republican party beyond the possibility of retrieval.' *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, II, 88.

'If the Republicans of Illinois should . . . re-elect Mr. Douglas, their party would be so disintegrated that the State would be lost to freedom in 1860.' *Chicago Tribune*, April 21, 1858.

Private letters from Republican politicians were emphatic against Republican support of Douglas.

Governor Bissell wrote Trumbull that 'by *our* friends, generally, no *credit* whatever is allowed him.' Douglas's sole motive was to make sure of reëlection. 'But the people understand him.' Bissell, Springfield, to Trumbull, Dec. 12, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

'The course of the Republican party is plain. Let it keep clear of all alliances, and profit by the [party] treason, without taking the traitor to its embraces.' Charles L. Wilson (editor *Chicago Journal*), Chicago, to Trumbull, Dec. 14, 1857. *Ib.*

'When Judge D. is made our Leader . . . the [Republican] party is scattered and Disbanded in Ill[inois]. I never will be a party to that *Fraud. . . . Are our friends crazy?*' Jesse K. Dubois, to Trumbull, Springfield, Apr. 8, 1858. *Ib.*

'You cannot get the Republicans of Illinois to touch him [Douglas] with a thousand foot pole. . . . Illinois will this fall go 25 to 30 thousand republican if the work is permitted to go on in a legitimate consistent way.' Parmenas Bond to Trumbull, Carlyle, Ill., June 2, 1858. *Ib.*

'Great God, I was once proud of the name of Democrat. . . . And Oh! my country! . . . Are we to have a captain . . . not of our choice, a traitor to our cause, . . . forced upon us? . . . [It] is an insult and an infamy that I will not passively submit to.' L. P. Cooper, Marshall, Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 17, 1858. *Ib.*

To like effect were numbers of other letters from all over the State. For example, John Tillson, Quincy, Nov. 30, 1857; A. Jonas, Dec. 5, 1857, and Apr. 11, 1858; W. B. Archer, Marshall, Jan. 21, 1858; Wm. Pickering, Albion, Jan. 11, 1858; J. T. Knox, —, Jan. 4, 1857; D. L. Phillips (Land Dept. I.C.R.R. Co.) Chicago, Jan. 2, 1858; Bailhache and Baker (owners *Illinois State Journal*), Springfield, Dec. 18, 1857.

A few Republicans felt not unkindly toward Douglas for his Lecompton stand, but even most of these thought that he should be used as long as he could help the Republican cause, and then dropped. Wm. C. Fleharty, Apple Grove, Ill., Jan. 4, 1858. '"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."' Charles Johnson, York, Ill., to Trumbull, Feb. 6, 1858. *Ib.*

[2] Charles H. Ray, editor of *Chicago Press and Tribune*, Chicago, to Trumbull, March 9, 1858. *Ib.*

Always anxious to prevent party feuds, Lincoln was now acutely so. Republican papers in Chicago were making war on 'Long John' Wentworth, owner and editor of the *Chicago Democrat*, and one of the ablest party managers in the State. He was an original Republican, but other editors and rival politicians hated and assailed him. In a moment, we shall hear the charge that Wentworth was plotting to be made Senator and we shall see the nomination of Lincoln in order to prevent the success of Wentworth's plans.

In a letter to Whitney on a legal matter Lincoln went out of his way to add a strong protest against the attacks on Wentworth. 'Let me say to you confidentially, that I do not entirely appreciate what the republican papers of Chicago are so constantly saying against Long John. I consider those papers truly devoted to the republican cause, and not unfriendly to me; but I *do* think that more of what they say against "Long John" is dictated by personal malice than they themselves are conscious of. We cannot afford to lose the services of "Long John" and I do believe the unrelenting warfare made upon him, is injuring our cause. I mean this to be confidential,' of course; but let Whitney 'quietly co-operate' with my friend, John O. Johnson, who was 'trying to get up a republican organization.'[1] In short, without offending the friendly Chicago Republican editors, let Whitney and Johnson stop the newspaper assaults upon the strong Chicago politician.

The situation at home and news from the East, especially Greeley's course, depressed Lincoln extremely. One morning he came into the office and told his partner how he felt toward the New York editor: 'Greeley is not doing me right. . . . I am a true Republican and have been tried already in the hottest part of the anti-slavery fight, and yet I find him taking up Douglas, a veritable dodger — once a tool of the South, now its enemy — and pushing him to the front.'[2]

Worried by Lincoln's gloom, the junior partner went East to learn what he could and, if possible, to do something to help his

[1] Lincoln to Whitney, Springfield, Dec. 18, 1857. Photostat, among others, of Whitney MSS. owned by Judge Henry Horner, Chicago, Ill. Judge Horner was the partner of Whitney's son. The letter is also in *Works:* XI, 102.

[2] Herndon, II, 390–1.

chief; but he defensively adds that Lincoln did not want him to go.[1] Herndon wished to see Douglas more than any one else: '*I want to look him in the eye.*'[2] He could make the trip easily since his time at home was chiefly taken up by people crowding the office about 'three cent law suits;'[3] the journey would not be expensive to the Bank Commissioner of Illinois who travelled on passes as all public officials, as well as railroad attorneys, then did.

Douglas was sick in bed, but he saw Herndon and asked about Lincoln. 'He is not in anybody's way, not even in yours, Judge Douglas,' said Lincoln's emissary, astutely. Nor was *he* in Lincoln's way, responded Douglas, undeceived and with the politician's self-defensive guile; *he* would not start a fight. 'Give Mr. Lincoln my regards when you return, and tell him I have crossed the river and burned my boat.'[4]

Carefully Herndon went over the situation with Trumbull who was 'quite positive, however, that Douglas had no idea of casting his lot with the Republican party.' Seward, Wilson, and other Republican leaders gave his agent cold comfort as a matter of fact.[5] Hastily he wrote to Lincoln, telling what he had heard.[6]

Off to New York went the junior partner to plead Lincoln's cause with Greeley. The editor stood by his guns; he wanted Douglas sent back to the Senate, and said that the Republican papers of Illinois were fools to oppose him. Herndon protested — was Greeley really for the new party or did he 'want Douglas to ride to power through the North, which he has so much abused and betrayed?'

'Let the future alone,' Greeley retorted; 'it will all come right. Douglas is a brave man. Forget the past and sustain the *righteous.*'

[1] Herndon, II, 392.

[2] Herndon to Parker, March 4, 1858. Newton, 150.

[3] Same to same, Feb. 24, 1858. *Ib.*, 144.

[4] Herndon, II. 'Bill Herndon is here — says Douglas is the biggest man on earth, and all that.' Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, March 11, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[5] Newton, 151.

[6] Herndon to Lincoln, Boston, March 24, 1858. Herndon, II, 395. 'I wrote you a hasty letter from Washington.'

'Good God, *righteous*, eh!' exclaimed Herndon, when by letter he reported this talk to his chief.[1] Greeley had also said: 'The Republican standard is too high; we want something practical.' What a sentiment from the apostle of liberty and light! Yet this was at least one opinion of the radical editor with which Lincoln agreed, as we shall see.

In Boston, 'this city of notions,' as Herndon called it, Governor Banks and others asked Lincoln's messenger:

'You will sustain Douglas in Illinois, won't you?'

'*No, never!*' exclaimed the loyal Herndon to the surprise of the Boston Republicans, and he talked to them about Lincoln. But, 'the Northern men are cold to me,' he wrote to his senior. 'It is my duty to state what is going on, so that you may head it off.'[2] Lincoln needed no urging to repair Republican alignment, if broken. 'Mr. Lincoln is now in Chicago,' reported the party organizer, Johnson; 'our friends all over the State are hopeful and working with a will.'[3]

When the junior partner came back he brought with him 'additional sermons and lectures by Theodore Parker, . . . one of these was a lecture on "The Effect of Slavery on the American People."' Lincoln read and liked it, and marked with pencil Parker's favorite sentence which we have heard the Boston preacher use so often: 'Democracy is direct self government, over all the people, for all the people, by all the people.'[4] Herndon brought back another book, which Lincoln did not like, but which was to become the most effective of Republican campaign documents before and during the campaign for his election to the Presidency. It was Helper's *Impending Crisis* which, in due time, we shall look into. Herndon had had a good time but had accomplished nothing for his hero.

In Illinois the old line Democrats and officeholders grew ever

[1] Herndon to Lincoln, Boston, March 24, 1858. Herndon, II, 394–5.

[2] *Ib.* On his trip Herndon also stopped at Baltimore and Philadelphia, and he visited Plymouth and Lowell, Mass. He came back by Niagara Falls and through Canada to Chicago. Herndon to Trumbull, Apr. 7, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

Herndon returned to Springfield, Apr. 5, 1858, having been gone just one month; he had a fine trip 'bating a little for disappointments and rebuffs.' Herndon to Parker, April 7, 1858. Newton, 156–8.

[3] John O. Johnson, Springfield, Ill., to Trumbull, Feb. 16, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[4] Herndon's statement in Herndon, II, 396.

more active against Douglas. Heads of his United States marshals, collectors, and postmasters fell by the dozen.[1] An Administration paper called the Douglas organ at Springfield a 'dirty blackguard and lying thief;'[2] the Douglas press retorted that the Administration leaders were 'stink fingers.'[3] Let the good work go on, said the Republicans to one another: 'If they will only make a Kilkenney cat affair of it, so much the better.'[4] There was small fear that they would not. So implacable was the wrath of the factions that such violent pro-Southern and pro-slavery Democrats as John A. Logan, 'an arrant trickster of the blackguard order,'[5] as the Republican organ at Springfield then branded him, said that they preferred even Seward to the President.[6] The Administration men felt even more bitter toward the party 'traitor' — anything to beat Douglas! Local conventions of Administration Democrats passed resolutions denunciatory of him — they would do what they could to 'silence' him, ran one adopted at Aurora.[7] A big Administration meeting at North Chicago was of like temper.[8]

'I really believe his [Buchanan's ticket] will poll as many votes next fall in Illinois as Douglas's ticket,' Medill, of the *Chicago Tribune*, wrote to Trumbull; at any rate the Republicans must 'nurse' the Administration Democrats; the Douglas men despair of his getting back to the Senate.[9] Unauthorized by

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Jan. 30, March 24, April 30, May 8, June 7, 30, July 8, 23; *Ottawa Republican*, Feb. 20; *Quincy Whig*, Feb. 22; *Rockford Republican*, Feb. 25; *Chicago Daily Times*, April 6, 16, 1858.

[2] *Cairo* (Ill.) *Times and Delta*, April 7, 1858.

[3] *Quincy Herald*, clipped in *Illinois State Register*, June 19, 1858.

[4] David L. Phillips, Land Office (I.C.R.R. Co.), Jonesboro Station, Union Co., Ill., to Trumbull, Feb. 16, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[5] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, April 22, 1858.

[6] Ben. L. Wiley, Anna, Ill., to Trumbull, March 2, 1858. Trumbull papers.

[7] *Chicago Press*, March 30, 1858.

Accounts of these anti-Douglas Democratic County Conventions were published conspicuously in the Republican press: *Quincy Whig*, June 4; *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 8; *Aurora Beacon*, June 10, 17. These Administration conventions continued to be held throughout the campaign.

The *Illinois Daily State Journal*, May 11, 27, June 2, clipped from Administration papers in Illinois vitriolic excerpts against Douglas.

[8] *Chicago Press*, March 11, 1858.

[9] Joseph Medill to Trumbull, Apr. 13, 1858. Trumbull MSS. 'I look upon the defeat of Douglas as certain . . . the Democracy being so divided.' William M. Beck, editor *Olney Times*, to Trumbull, Apr. 11, 1858. *Ib.* If Administration Democrats put a ticket

him, his friends sent out 'feelers' to the Republicans — they wanted to make some sort of a deal; 'but as yet our men stand firm,' Herndon advised Parker. The junior partner admitted, however, that these advances 'do not purport to come from Douglas.' [1]

A country Republican editor was sure that Douglas's defeat was made certain by the completeness of the Democratic split.[2] The fight between the Democratic factions was another 'war of the roses,' said the *Quincy Whig*.[3] 'Buchanan is driving off the Douglas men every day and my firm conviction is that he will have at least one-third of the democracy of this State,' the Republican State Chairman happily reported to Trumbull.[4] It was also the 'conviction' of the editor of the *Chicago Tribune* that Douglas would soon have fewer than a thousand supporters in that city — indeed he would be lucky if he had half that number.[5]

It is impossible to overstate the ferocity of the Democratic factions toward one another, and as we shall see, the hatred was more virulent than ever on election day, when, to beat Douglas, most of the President's supporters voted the Republican ticket — those in Chicago did so almost to a man.[6] The Republican managers knew what they were about when they fanned the fury between the sections of their old foes. The same thing has been done time and again, and is still done, with like results.

in the field 'our victory will be easy.' Thos. J. Moore, Starfield, Peoria Co., Ill., to Trumbull, Apr. 9, 1858. *Ib.* And see *Chicago Press*, March 20, 1858.

[1] Herndon to Parker, Apr. 17, 1858. Newton, 161. Herndon undoubtedly makes reference to a story in a letter by C. H. Ray, editor *Chicago Tribune*, stating that the editor of the *Chicago Times* proposed a working agreement with the Republicans by which Douglas would get out of Lincoln's way and 'take his chance by and by.' The details are contradictory and the whole is so absurd that mention is made of it only to show the excited and credulous state of mind of Illinois Republican politicians at that time. Some of them doubted it from the first. Jesse K. Dubois to Trumbull, Springfield, March 22, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

Parker had sent two sermons to Herndon whose letter was chiefly about them and religion. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the friendship between the Boston preacher and Lincoln's partner, and especially upon the fact that most of Parker's writings were in the office of Lincoln and Herndon.

[2] Beck, *Olney Times*, to Trumbull, Apr. 11, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] Apr. 28, 1858. [4] Judd to Trumbull, March 19, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[5] C. H. Ray, Chicago, to Trumbull, March 9, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[6] Sheahan, 433.

The conflict was between 'the Douglas heretics or the Buchanan orthodox Democrats. . . . Let the Buchanan men be up and doing,' said the wily Wentworth in an editorial of pretended fairness.[1] So Republicans hopefully believed that, at last, the locks of the Little Giant were shorn — or that he was a 'dead lion' or 'at least a toothless one,' as Lincoln is soon to describe him.

There were no signs of fear among the Douglas clan when, at Springfield, on April 21, 1858, the Democratic State Convention met. They outnumbered the Buchanan men ten to one and, without directly attacking the President by name, adopted a Douglas platform with a thunder of cheers.[2] The feature of the Convention was a fiery speech for Douglas by Usher F. Linder of Coles County, an old line Whig, who had joined the Democrats two years before on the 'negro equality' issue.[3] Most conspicuous of the delegates was the venerable Peter Cartwright, Lincoln's opponent for Congress a dozen years earlier. The old Methodist Circuit Rider was strong for Douglas, and to the charge that his hero had joined the black Republicans, the white-haired preacher exclaimed in a speech almost incoherent in its wrath: *he* gone to the black Republicans! 'Gone to Halifax!' [4]

Supporters of the Administration, numbering a little over a hundred, mostly postmasters and other Federal officials, bolted and called a State convention of 'the national Democracy' for June 9. The Douglas men branded them 'spaniels,' 'hounds,' 'janizaries.' [5] 'By Douglas I stand to the bitter end,' exclaimed

[1] *Chicago Daily Democrat*, March 11, 1858.

[2] Sheahan, 394. The Douglas platform declared for the Union, for States' Rights, and against 'sectional strife;' reaffirmed the Cincinnati platform as the only standard of Democratic faith; reasserted the principle of popular sovereignty, and demanded that the whole Lecompton Constitution be submitted to the people. Douglas and each of the Illinois Democratic delegation in the House were endorsed by name, for their fight against the Lecompton plan; and the Administration was approved *so far as it had or would carry out Democratic principles as set forth in the Cincinnati platform 'and affirmed in these resolutions.'* See also *Illinois Daily State Register*, Apr. 22, 1858. Italics author's.

[3] The *Chicago Daily Times*, Apr. 27, 1858, printed Linder's speech in full.

[4] *Chicago Press*, Apr. 23, 1858. 'Peter Cartwright, a venerable Methodist Boanerges . . . shut his eyes and went it blind, without knowing or caring what he said, or whom he hit.' *Chicago Tribune*, Apr. 23, 1858.

[5] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, April 23, 1858.

a powerful Democratic worker. 'What a spectacle! a few graceless and mercenary scoundrels, attempting to break down the Illinois Democracy!' [1]

The factions were hot, bitter, and malicious towards each other, wrote Herndon, who with his senior partner mingled with the throng and saw the bolt.[2] 'Do not forget that it is to be war to the knife. No quarters are to be asked or given' — a state of hostilities that delighted the Republicans.[3] They expected to 'have fun,' too, at the old line Democratic Convention. 'Douglas . . . is to be crushed by the Administration;' [4] predicted Herndon, and 'we may look out for squalls.' [5]

Which, asked Lincoln's organ in Springfield, '*is* the Democratic Party.' [6] The editor of that paper reported to Trumbull that 'as you are aware,' the *State Journal* had been doing all it could to incite Administration Democrats against Douglas; but that they now needed no further urging. 'They are hard at work manipulating throughout the State.' Douglas would lose half his strength if the Lecompton bill went through in any form. The Republicans were 'full of enthusiasm,' and after the Douglas Convention, they had a 'caucus' in the State Library, decided to have a Republican State Convention, and issued a call for it next day. 'Between the two Democracies,' the Republicans were sure to win.[7]

Lincoln was encouraged. The Democrats were downhearted, he wrote to Washburne, and 'our friends . . . in high spirits. They think that if we do not triumph, the fault will be our own, and so I really think.' [8] Yet he was disturbed by Greeley's efforts for Douglas and the partiality of Republican Senators and

[1] Aug. C. French, Lebanon, Ill., to Lanphier, June 14, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[2] Herndon, Springfield, to Trumbull, Apr. 24, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] Herndon to Parker, Apr. 27, 1858. Newton, 161.

[4] Same to same, May 29, 1858. *Ib.*, 163.

[5] Herndon to Trumbull, Apr. 24, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[6] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Apr. 21, 1858.

[7] Edward L. Baker, editor *Illinois Daily State Journal*, Springfield, to Trumbull, May 1, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

Lincoln, Ray [editor *Chicago Tribune*], Judd [Republican State Chairman], Brown [editor *Alton Courier*], Hay, William Bross [of *Chicago Democratic Press* and later of the *Press* and *Tribune*], 'went down stairs' after the Democratic disruption and called their convention. Herndon, Springfield, to Trumbull, Apr. 24, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[8] Lincoln to Washburne, Apr. 26, 1858. *Works*, II, 356–8.

Representatives to him. Some Illinois Republicans suspected even Washburne, but Lincoln was sure that they were mistaken, he told his friend.[1] Still, 'we are not yet clear out of the woods by a great deal;' trouble might be stirred up over '"Americanism." If that were out of the way, for all the rest, I believe we should be "out of the woods."' [2]

Some strong Republicans were becoming lukewarm from another cause. Judge T. Lyle Dickey, one of Lincoln's best friends, went over to the enemy, because the new party was 'too closely allied to the abolitionists.' When Whitney told Lincoln of Dickey's probable defection, he took it greatly to heart and said that 'he did not know of any of his friends he felt so badly about losing, as Dickey.' [3] Another indication of trouble ahead was the small number of old line Whigs who took part in Republican county conventions.[4]

The Republican politicians of Illinois had worked hard to strengthen their party so as to be sure to win in 1858, and their prevision had been highly practical: in order to carry the Legislature, 'we must have *money* and let us *COLONIZE* some four or five districts — and begin now — this fall — without fail — this must be done — and can be done with money — and the end Justifies the means in this instance,' the Republican Secretary of State had written to Trumbull.[5] To provide ways and means for this good end, the State Committee met at Chicago

[1] Lincoln to Washburne, May 10, 1858. *Ib.*, 359.

[2] Same to same, May 15, 1858. *Ib.*, 361.

[3] Whitney, 382–3. Whitney's talk with Lincoln was after midnight in April, 1858, on the Illinois Central Railroad train from Champaign to Chicago. Lincoln explained that he 'had passes on the Illinois Central and Great Western, both — hence could get to Chicago by that circuitous route free, while he had no pass by the direct route.'

Dickey, an old line Whig, had been with Lincoln at the Bloomington Convention in 1856. He did not like the abolition tendency of the new party at that time but had gone with it reluctantly; and when the Abolitionist, Owen Lovejoy, was nominated for Congress as a Republican over Leonard Swett, Dickey bolted. But it would appear that he voted for Frémont.

So much notice of Dickey is necessary, because he was typical of many old line Whigs who wanted to be Republicans, but disliked 'niggerism' more than democracy; and also because Dickey became a serious factor in the Lincoln-Douglas fight.

[4] For instance, of forty-one delegates at the Republican Convention at Joliet only five were old line Whigs; while of ten delegates sent from there to the Republican State Convention, but one was an old line Whig. *Joliet Signal*, May 25, 1858.

[5] O. M. Hatch to Trumbull, Springfield, July 13, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

and State Chairman Judd, Joseph Medill, and a man of the name of Gage were appointed a sub-committee 'with full power' to look after the matter. When reporting from Springfield to Trumbull the outcome of this vital party conference, Hatch adds: 'Mr. Lincoln has not returned from Chicago.' [1]

Nothing was overlooked that might help the party. Agents were even sent out to get subscriptions for Republican newspapers, especially for the *Chicago Press and Tribune*. One of these agents was a young man of the name of John G. Nicolay of Pittsfield, Pike County, who was soon to be made Lincoln's private secretary. He could get few subscriptions, because of the hard times, he claimed; [2] but Secretary of State Hatch, who, with Trumbull, appears to have had Nicolay on his hands, declared that he was a failure as a newspaper solicitor and would have to be put in the State Auditor's office.[3] There we shall find him when news of Lincoln's nomination came.

Other agents had better luck — as C. D. Hay, who got five hundred subscribers to take the *Tribune*, 'which has great effect,' he wrote to Trumbull, but added that he feared 'that that lying, drunken demagogue Douglas will be returned to the U.S. Senate. We ought to put in the noble Lincoln and we would if we could have half a chance. . . . E. B. Webb and his clique here are *ultra*-pro-slavery, out against Lincoln.' [4]

Although so depressed by the enthusiasm of Republicans in other States for Douglas that he did nothing for a long time, Lincoln felt better when the Democrats began fighting one another more savagely; and thereafter he made speeches over the State wherever meetings could be arranged. Usually local Republicans spoke with him at the same time and place,[5] some-

[1] O. M. Hatch to Trumbull, July 17, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

[2] Nicolay, from Pike and Randolph Cos., to Trumbull, Dec. 20, 1857. *Ib.*

[3] O. M. Hatch, Springfield, Ill., Nov. 23, 1857. *Ib.* The obligation to take care of Nicolay may have arisen from the fact that he was editor of the *Pike Co. Free Press* in 1856 and had endorsed the call for the editors' meeting at Decatur, which, in turn, issued the call for the historic Bloomington Convention of that year. In 1857 Nicolay left the *Free Press* and Hatch and Trumbull appear to have had a hard time in finding occupation for him.

[4] C. D. Hay, from Burnt Prairie, Ill., to Trumbull, July 10, 1857. Also same to same, Oct. 4, and Nov. 8, 1857. *Ib.*

[5] For instance, at Moro, Ill., Mark Delahay, then living at Alton, Palmer, and Gillespie spoke with Lincoln. W. C. Flagg, Moro, Ill., to Trumbull, June 5, 1858. 'I

times with a strange understanding as to what was to be said. The sentiment of the party had crystallized about Lincoln for Senator and the rank and file, as well as most politicians, were for him.[1] 'I take it that it is a foregone conclusion that Abm. Lincoln will be the next Republican candidate for Mr. Douglas' seat, and that he will occupy it, if we have a majority, or, that we must make up our minds to a fight as soon as his friends can make a good ready,' said the leading Republican editor of the State.[2]

Lincoln's friends made 'a good ready,' indeed, as we shall presently see, so good, in fact, that they did not have to fight at all to nominate him. For he had taken to heart, although belatedly, the blunt warning of the Republican State Chairman that if he wanted to be Senator, he must work for it, especially in Central Illinois.[3]

The pressure from the Republican leaders and press of the East and even of States adjacent to Illinois, upon Illinois Republicans to support Douglas, did not abate.[4] The party organi-

have written Lincoln to come down to our [County] Convention and give us a speech.' C. D. Hay, Newton, Ill., to Trumbull, May 29, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[1] The fact that he had been 'cheated' out of the Senatorship when Trumbull was elected and that it was understood then that Lincoln should have the place next time, had much to do with this favorable trend to Lincoln. In an extremely long letter on the situation, Palmer wrote Trumbull that since Lincoln had helped elect Trumbull and thus put him and his friends in the forefront of the new party, they must now help elect Lincoln. Palmer, Carlinville, Ill., to Trumbull, May 25, 1858. *Ib.*

But agreement on Lincoln was not spontaneous. Early in the year, some were inquiring 'who is our best man against him [Douglas] — Lincoln?' L. Jay S. Turner, Southern Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 10, 1858. *Ib.*

'The *La Salle Press*, an able and out-spoken Republican paper, declares itself against any and all efforts to commit the Republicans of Illinois to the support of Wentworth or Lincoln.' *Chicago Daily Times*, May 26, 1858.

Even a fortnight after Lincoln was nominated for Senator by the Republican State Convention a Republican paper said that while it was 'heartily' for Lincoln, still 'in case Mr. Lincoln should decline the honor, or from cause not be run, we could name a number of other distinguished Republicans whom the people of Illinois would delight to honor, . . . any one of these would make a fit Representative with Lyman Trumbull, in sustaining the interests of the Prairie State at Washington.' *Canton Weekly Register*, July 6, 1858, quoting with approval the *Hamilton Representative*.

[2] C. H. Ray, Chicago, to Trumbull, March 9, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] Judd, Chicago, to Trumbull, Apr. 19, 1858. 'If Lincoln expects to be Senator he must make a personal canvass for it in the center of the State. So I advised him two months ago — but I do not hear of any fruits.' *Ib.*

[4] From February to the time of Lincoln's nomination, editorials for Douglas were frequent in the New York *Tribune*. Greeley promptly answered the rebuke of the Chicago Republican papers. For instance see New York *Tribune*, May 11, 27, 1858.

zation and papers of that State were furious. Judd said that he would resign as State Chairman, if such a thing was done — 'I enter my solemn protest and shall ground my arms.' [1] Medill, whose paper had fiercely told Eastern journals to mind their own business and keep out of Illinois,[2] wrote to Herndon that he was afraid that Republicans in the north part of the State would go for Douglas who intended to 'assume steep Free-soil ground' and attack the President on the stump. Lincoln's conclusion was that 'there certainly is a double game being played somehow;' but unless Douglas played it better 'than we have often seen done,' he would lose more Democrats in the south part of the State than he would gain Republicans in the north.[3]

A story went the rounds that Seward, Weed, and Greeley had met Douglas in Chicago during October, 1857, and made an agreement that if that powerful Republican triumvirate would support Douglas for reëlection to the Senate next year, he would support Seward for the Presidency in 1860; and to this secret bargain Herndon attributed Douglas's 'savage attacks against Lecompton.' [4] It is not known who invented this canard. The tale was actually believed, although the presence in Chicago at the same time of men so much in the public eye as was each of the 'conspirators' could not have failed of notice in the press; and yet not a word was published that any of them was in town. Still more important, Greeley had broken with Seward four years earlier, because the Senator and Weed had not helped

[1] Judd to Trumbull, Chicago, March 7, 1858. Trumbull MSS. This confidential letter of the Republican State Chairman shows a close working arrangement between Republican managers and Administration Democrats: 'The declaration amongst the Democrats [of Chicago] was universal that Douglas's fate was sealed. . . . The present prospect is that the administration will have at least one third of the democracy of this State;' if Judd had to choose between the President and Douglas, 'I would sooner serve in the ranks of the administration.'

Judd insisted that the postmaster at Chicago, recently appointed by Buchanan in place of the Douglas postmaster, must be put in office at once: 'To hesitate about the confirmation of Cook, in the present state of dissolving Douglasism is the most suicidal policy that ever men of sense adopted.' The Republican State Chairman raged at Republicans in Washington who favored Douglas — they thus had killed the Republican party: 'Poor defunct institution swallowed up by a miserable Douglas faction yielding up the ghost of its own accord without ever being attacked.'

[2] For example, *Chicago Tribune*, Apr. 21, 1858. The Republican press throughout the State printed similar defiances.

[3] Lincoln to Washburne, May 27, 1858. *Works*, II, 361–2.

[4] Herndon to Parker, Springfield, Sept. 20, 1858. Newton, 215–6.

the editor to public office,[1] and from that time forward he was against the nomination of Seward.

With that shrewd common sense, as well as frankness and honesty, which were dominant elements of his character, Lincoln wrote to the editor of the *Chicago Journal* that he did not believe that Greeley's support of Douglas was the result of 'any secret arrangement' between them: he favored Douglas only because he believed that the reëlection of that eminent Senator would do 'the general cause of Republicanism more good than would the election of any one of our better undistinguished pure Republicans.' Seward, too, was in the same state of mind, said Lincoln, and neither he nor Greeley were doing anything directly for Douglas. Anyway, Lincoln would not retaliate. 'Let me pledge you my word that neither I, nor any friend so far as I know, has been setting [a] stake against Governor Seward. No combination has been made by me, or proposed to me, in relation to the next presidential candidate.' [2]

During all these months of Democratic division and quarreling and of Republican rejoicing, hope, doubt, suspicion, fear, and anger — months of wild rumor, vague imagining, fruitless plan — the relentless fight in Congress over the Lecompton Constitution had gone on. As we have seen, not all Southern men supported it,[3] not even all the fire-eaters. One of its opponents was in the Senate, the now venerable John J. Crittenden of Kentucky, stern old line Whig, ardent 'American,' and national leader of that party. Because of what now took place, we shall see him come to Douglas's help in the bitter struggle in Illinois just ahead of us, a circumstance that hurt Lincoln badly. Some, indeed, said that Crittenden beat Lincoln.

Senator Crittenden offered an amendment to the Lecompton bill which, in effect, was that the Constitution should be sent back to Kansas and the whole of it submitted to the people. The

[1] Greeley to Seward, New York, Nov. 11, 1854. *Horace Greeley:* Don C. Seitz, 160–6. 'It seems to me a fitting time to announce to you the dissolution of the political firm of Seward, Weed, and Greeley, by the withdrawal of the junior partner.' This letter, which explains so much in Republican politics for five years after it was written, was not made public until after Lincoln's nomination for the Presidency.

[2] Lincoln to Charles L. Wilson, June 1, 1858. *Works,* II, 362–4.

[3] 'The Tenn. and Ky. delegations are almost all *with us,* now.' Thos. L. Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, May 17, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

Democratic majority beat this, only Douglas and his three insurgents from that party voting for it. In the House, however, the Crittenden amendment was adopted. Douglas had carried with him the solid Democratic delegation from his own State, several Democratic Representatives from other parts of the North, and most 'Americans' from the South.

So Senate and House were deadlocked. From every point of view, the President was sure that, in some form, the Lecompton bill must pass. 'The defeat of the Bill would alarm the fears of the country for the Union, reduce the value of property, and injuriously interfere with our reviving trade,' he said in a 'private and confidential' letter.[1] Finally a compromise was devised by a Committee of Conference. It was offered in the House by William H. English of Indiana. This was the celebrated 'English Bill.' In substance, it provided that the people should vote on the Lecompton Constitution as a whole, and, if they ratified it, the State should be admitted at once; but if they rejected it, Kansas should remain out of the Union until that Territory had enough people to entitle her to one Representative in Congress.[2]

By this adroit manœuvre, enough rebellious Democrats were won over to pass the bill.[3] Also rank corruption was made use of. Wendell, the Public Printer, and owner of the Administration organ, spent money 'by the bushel,' House officials and newspaper men were employed as lobbyists, members were

[1] Buchanan to Denver, March 27, 1858. Moore, 200–2. 'The Pres[ident] is putting on the thumb screws and says he will run it through in 30 days or break.' Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, Jan. 21, 28, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[2] The number required was 93,423. Kansas then had about 35,000 population. 'The English scheme is a miserable one. No one likes it. We would beat it twenty votes but for pressure — but it may pass.' Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, Apr. 29, 1858. *Ib.*

[3] Senator Pugh of Ohio deserted Douglas on this bill.

Governors of Southern States who thought it their duty to call secession conventions if 'Southern rights' were again denied, were relieved by the passage of the English bill, albeit, under that measure, or any other, there was no likelihood that Kansas would be made a slave State.

'I am truly glad we are rid of this vexed question. I feel that the South has lost nothing of principle by the passage of the bill. . . . It, however, will receive the hearty approval of the great mass of our people. Had the bill not passed, there would have been great confusion in Georgia. The storm was suspended in a breathless calm awaiting the result in Washington,' which would have broken if the bill had failed. 'No action which you or I or any one else could have taken would have prevented it. . . . I rejoice at the result.' Joseph E. Brown, Governor of Georgia, to Stephens, Milledgeville, May 7, 1858. *Rept. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1911, II, 434.

bought outright.[1] Fervid pleas were made to Douglas to accept the compromise; here was a chance to line up with his party again, they said; in reality he had won, since the whole Constitution would be submitted, and it was reasonably certain that the people would reject the Lecompton Constitution at the polls. Even the Democratic managers at Springfield wanted him to take this easy way out and thus make peace in the party.[2]

With scorn Douglas said, No! The English Bill was a trick and a fraud — sheer bribery, in fact; unless the people accepted a slave State Constitution, they were to be punished by being kept out of the Union until they became nearly three times more numerous than they now were. As a rule, he was for statehood for any Territory only when it had population enough to elect a member of the House; but in the case of Kansas, a population big enough to make it a slave State, was big enough to make it a free State.

What mad obstinacy! said regular Democrats; what sheer, egotistic bull-headedness! From the President down, they were more furious, if possible, than before. Should such insurgency go unpunished! No! At all hazards Douglas must be beaten. The President was puzzled as well as angry: 'How Douglas . . . could have preferred the do-nothing policy, with all its inevitable consequences, to the English Bill, which leaves to the people of Kansas to decide their own destiny, I am utterly at a loss to

[1] *Covode Investigation*, 120–56. Wendell said to a clerk of the House whose services he purchased: 'A bushel of gold is no object in this matter.' Testimony M. P. Bean, Apr. 26, 1860. *Ib.*, 120–3. Wendell gave Bean $5000.

Although the Covode Investigation was largely a Republican partisan manœuvre, it uncovered frauds and corruption in the Departments as well as in Congress and thus rendered an inestimable public service. Buchanan bitterly opposed it, chiefly on the ground that it was a mere partisan dragnet, for campaign purposes. The celebrated report became one of the strongest Republican campaign documents in the election of 1860 and knowledge of venality thus given had much to do with the election of Lincoln.

'Well it's over. . . . The progress of this business has been damnably corrupt. The adm[inistration] has bought men like hogs in the market.' Harris, Washington, to Lanphier, Apr. 30, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

'Some ten days ago we went down to Washington . . . we stayed in the great city five days. . . . Offices are bought just as openly as the butcher buys the beef intended for his customers.' *Chicago Daily Times*, March 17, 1858. Editor's statement.

[2] 'The *Register* cabal, I am sure, were very anxious to have Douglas adopt the English substitute.' Edward L. Baker, editor *Illinois State Journal*, Springfield, to Trumbull May 1, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

imagine,' he wrote to an intimate friend several weeks after the matter was settled and when he was on his vacation.[1]

'Fun' indeed the Republicans had, as Herndon predicted, when, on June 9, 1858, the Administration Democrats held their State Convention at Springfield. The proceedings were 'boisterous.' Douglas was denounced in stinging resolutions, and his defeat demanded. He and his supporters were 'rebels' and 'enemies of Democracy,' said the Convention speakers; the President was 'able and patriotic.' [2] Douglas men present were assaulted, noses pulled, blows struck.[3] Candidates were put in the field against those nominated by the Douglas Convention. One of these was former Governor John Reynolds, 'the Old Ranger,' a stubborn Democrat of the Jackson school.

It was well known that Lincoln would oppose Douglas, yet the 'Danites' were also out to beat the Little Giant, said his campaign biographer two years later.[4] The Republican press and organization continued to cheer the Administration faction just as the Democrats had done with the Fillmore men in the Frémont campaign. In 1860 the editor of the *Chicago Times* charged, without denial then or thereafter, that the Republicans spent sixty thousand dollars to keep 'the Danite party on its legs' that year.[5]

Thus was the stage set for the historic Republican State Convention at Springfield, June 16, 1858. Another and an indispensable piece of scenery, however, must here be shifted into place. During the fight in the Senate against the Lecompton Constitution, the Republican Senators made a concerted strate-

[1] Buchanan, Bedford Springs, Pa., to William B. Reed, July 31, 1858. Moore, x, 224–5. This remarkable letter clearly reveals the President's state of mind:

'I shall ever thank Heaven that my administration has been so successful in pacifying the Country on the Kansas question. Had Mr. Douglas been successful in defeating [all] Legislation on the subject, the Country would have been in a terrible condition at the present moment. The exasperation between the North and the South would have been more . . . dangerous than ever, and the Union would have been shaken to its centre. Georgia and Alabama, in this contingency, had provided by law for the call of State Conventions with a view to secession. Throughout the South all or nearly all are now satisfied; and General Davis of Mississippi and other gentlemen of high character who had been hitherto considered extreme have been making speeches in the North in favor of the Union. General D. is "a marvellous proper man."'

[2] *Alton Daily Courier*, June 14, 1858. [3] *Belleville Advocate*, June 16, 1858.

[4] Sheahan, 396–7. The 'Danites' were the supporters of Buchanan. [5] *Ib.*, 416.

gic move of first importance: they concentrated their fire on the Dred Scott decision and the Supreme Court. For eight years the Free-Soilers and Republicans had been attacking the judiciary in general, because it had sustained and executed the Federal statute and the Constitution as to fugitive slaves;[1] for a year the Dred Scott decision had been the best talking point the Republicans had, until the Lecompton 'infamy' gave them another, and now the whole agitation was brought to a head.

Republican Senators denounced Taney's opinion, denounced Taney, denounced the Supreme Court; some of them assailed all Courts. I have been brought up to respect Courts but have long since got over that superstition, asserted Hale: 'I have a higher respect for the Lecompton convention than I have for the Supreme Court.'[2] Wade said the same thing, and added: The Supreme Court could not 'decide the law of the land for every department of this Government. . . . Each department must act for itself,'[3] a good statement of the Republican constitutional view at that time, and one which Lincoln is often to repeat in his conflict with Douglas.[4]

The strongest appeal to voters made by any Republican Senator was that of a man who had just entered the Senate, and who was to become the most forcible member of that body during Lincoln's Administration, Zachariah Chandler of Michigan. It was his maiden speech. His tribute to free workingmen became one of the most effective of Republican campaign arguments; while his assault on the Supreme Court for the Dred Scott decision requires notice at this particular point in our story. 'They dare not attempt, at this time, . . . assert their whole meaning; but they take it piecemeal. . . . This is not the last aggression' — and Senator Chandler recounted the phases of the 'conspiracy,' the end of which was to be the spread of

[1] Warren, II, Chap. XXV. This and the two succeeding chapters of Mr. Warren's careful work are indispensable to an understanding of the politics of that time.

[2] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. I, 341, Jan. 20, 1858.

[3] *Ib.*, Pt. II, 1115, March 13, 1858.

[4] The *Illinois Daily State Journal*, March 11, 12, 1858, printed Seward's 'conspiracy' speech in full, and at various times, extracts from those of other Republican Senators. Lincoln also had the *Congressional Globe* which contained all proceedings in House and Senate.

slavery over the whole land and the revival of the African Slave trade.[1]

All Republican Senators agreed that the Dred Scott decision was but a part of one great plan, part of a 'program,' Fessenden of Maine called it in the best speech made upon the subject. See the procession of events, he said, each following the other logically, each necessary to the next, as if all had been arranged from the first! — Douglas's repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Pierce's course in Kansas, Taney's opinion, Buchanan's Lecompton policy! What could be plainer? The Supreme Court had even put off the Dred Scott decision until after the election; if the result of that had been different, the decision would have been different. And every step of the conspiracy had been taken under the pretence of giving the country peace! Had that been the result? On the contrary, the Nation was more disturbed than ever. Such a state of things must not go on. The conspiracy must be broken up. Slavery must be restricted because it was 'a curse,' a moral wrong.[2]

Seward summed up the Republican indictment in the dramatic charge of conspiracy already quoted.[3] Thus the Dred Scott decision as an essential element of a great plot to nationalize slavery, was made the chief count in the Republican indictment; [4] in a moment we shall hear Lincoln restate that count and make the strongest argument ever made in support of it.

And now the gigantic figure of 'Long John' Wentworth stalks fully into view, as a principal actor at a decisive hour in Lincoln's life. Since the perturbed Springfield lawyer had tried, through

[1] *Cong. Globe,* 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. II, 1072–89.

[2] *Ib.,* Pt. I, 614, *et seq.* In connection with all these speeches see Lincoln's house-divided speech.

[3] Senator Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana, who was to become Attorney General in the Confederate Government, made an uncommonly strong speech in rebuke of Seward's attack on Taney and the Supreme Court. *Cong. Globe,* 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. II, 1065–72. 'Accursed, thrice accursed, is that fell spirit of party' which could lead a Senator to do such a thing, etc.

Benjamin paid a noble tribute to Taney: 'he went so far as to send the old man to Heaven even before he died,' sneered Wade in reply. *Ib.,* 1114–5, March 13, 1858.

[4] 'If acquiesced in' the Dred Scott decision would carry slavery into every free State — this is to become the 'living issue for the next ten years before the American people.' Senator James Reed Doolittle of Wisconsin in Senate, Feb. 11, 1858, *Cong. Globe,* 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. I, 665.

Whitney and his party organizer, Johnson, to quiet the party row in Chicago, talk had sprung up that even if the new party should elect a majority of the Legislature, Wentworth would control it and be made Senator in Douglas's place. He had just been chosen Mayor of Chicago by the largest majority ever given in that city,[1] Republican factions combining for the moment, in order to beat the Douglas candidate as badly as they could.[2] Thus and with great éclat, 'Long John' had become the first Republican Mayor, who, as the party nominee and under the party name, had been chosen in any leading city in the land.[3]

The part played by Wentworth at this critical time in Lincoln's career is vital. Wentworth was a member of a famous Colonial and Revolutionary family of New Hampshire. After graduating from Dartmouth, he went West to seek his fortune, and, when he was twenty-one years old, finally reached Chicago on foot.[4] He helped to organize the little town and to get from the Legislature a charter for it. Then he returned East to take a course of law lectures at Harvard, and while there, wrote editorials for the *Chicago Democrat*, then edited by John Calhoun, bought it in 1836 on his return to Chicago, and speedily made it the leading daily newspaper of the Northwest.

He was in Congress four years before Lincoln became a member of the House, and stayed there eight years longer than Lincoln did.[5] When Lincoln was in Congress, Wentworth was an anti-slavery leader, and spoke and voted consistently against the slave interests. He fought the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and, the day after it was accomplished, joined other

[1] *Chicago Magazine*, Aug., 1857. I, 394.

[2] 'To show the world and his wife that Douglas's recent course had not broken the Republican ranks we went into the recent fight in our city. It was the most desperate political contest I ever had any connection with. We triumphed and what is the result? Men without the state are to break us down by elevating the very man [Douglas] we have prostrated in his stronghold.' Judd, Chicago, to Trumbull, March 7, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] In spite of all efforts to beat him thereafter, Wentworth was re-elected Mayor and continued in that office for several years. He was Mayor throughout the war.

[4] *Chicago Magazine*, 394.

[5] Wentworth was in his twenty-seventh year and Lincoln in his thirty-eighth year when they were elected to Congress. Wentworth was six years younger than Lincoln. The Chicago District extended to Danville.

anti-slavery members of Congress in the notable meeting to abandon the old parties and form a new one. Thus Wentworth was one of the founders of the Republican Party to which Lincoln finally attached himself.

No more resourceful politician lived in the State than 'Long John,' as Wentworth was called because of his great stature, for he was taller even than Lincoln.[1] But, during an extended career as a busy and aggressive politician and fighting journalist, he had made relentless enemies. Other papers than his own, Democratic and Republican, constantly denounced him in libellous terms. Yet at conventions he always turned up with a majority of delegates.

And now persistent rumor had it that the Chicago boss intended to pack Republican legislative conventions in the northern counties, nominate his men for the General Assembly and control that body if the Republicans should win in the fall. If Wentworth did this he would be made Senator, or at least, Lincoln would not be given that place.[2] Of this there was real dan-

[1] Six feet six inches. *Chicago Magazine*, 399.

[2] 'John Wentworth, the great leader of the Republicans in Illinois, the man who hopes to be my successor if he can be elected.' Douglas in the Senate, June 15, 1858. *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. III, 3058.

'Wentworth is a candidate, he openly declares that Lincoln can never get elected. Wentworth will go to the legislature from this county [Cook]. . . . They say that if he [Lincoln] does not carry Middle Illinois he forfeits all claim.' J. W. Sheahan (editor *Chicago Times*) to Lanphier, May 23, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

'The Republican aspirants for his [Douglas's] seat are Abrm. Lincoln and Long John Wentworth. . . . As there is no hope of electing a Buchaneer to the Senate, the patronage of the Administration is being made operative in the assistance of Lincoln or Wentworth,' etc. *Cincinnati Commercial* (Republican), clipped in *Chicago Daily Times*, May 25, 1858.

'Wentworth's blowers and strikers are busy in killing off Lincoln for the Senatorship. Their game in this District is to make Lincoln hang to Lovejoy's coat tail for Republican strength, well knowing that the semblance of a bargain with Lovejoy will choke Lincoln to death among the Republicans of the State generally. It is all arranged and we shall soon see the Lovejoy organs commence puffing Lincoln.' *Our Constitution*, Feb. 6, 1858. The *Joliet Signal*, July 27, charged that this deal between Lincoln and Lovejoy had been made.

'John Wentworth is a candidate for the United States Senate, and under no possible circumstances will Wentworth allow Lincoln to be chosen. . . . Wentworth intends (and will succeed in so doing) to pack the nominating conventions in the northern counties, that all republican candidates for the legislature will be his own creatures, pledged to vote for him through thick and thin.' *Chicago Times*, May 19, 1858, clipped in *Illinois Daily State Register*, May 21, 1858.

'As we have frequently asserted before, the Chicago autocrat of black republicanism will have complete control of a majority of the black republican votes in the next legisla-

ger, for 'Long John' did not think highly of Lincoln from any point of view, a state of mind he never got over.[1]

It was said, too, that Wentworth would have persuasive arguments against Lincoln. Had not Lincoln failed to capture for the Republicans the old line Whigs of Central Illinois in the Frémont campaign? And was not that his particular task? Had he not lost all that part of the State, lost his own district, his own county, his own town? If the same thing should happen again in the present campaign (and happen it did, as we shall see) what possible claim would Lincoln have upon Republicans to make him Senator in case they should elect a majority of the Legislature? None at all. On the contrary, it would then be the duty of the Republican caucus to select a better man — and Wentworth meant to name that man.

Such, according to political gossip, were the purposes of the Chicago Mayor and his reasons for them. How much truth there was in these reports cannot now be determined, but undoubtedly there was some ground for them. At any rate the story spread, and, in view of Wentworth's reputation, was widely believed. So his enemies and Lincoln's friends resolved to outwit the Chicago manipulator by the simple device of declaring in the Republican platform that Lincoln was the Republican candidate for Senator. Such a thing never had been done before in any State — even the Douglas Convention had not thus named their idol — and Wentworth could not well have foreseen so unprecedented a move.

It would have availed him nothing if he had suspected it, for the Chairman of the Republican State Committee, Norman B. Judd, was leader of the Chicago faction hostile to Wentworth,

ture, and if that party should have a majority of the whole . . . he will control the nominations of its caucus.' *Illinois Daily State Register*, May 21, 1858, editorial.

On May 31, 1858, Wentworth's paper printed a long and adroit editorial accusing Douglas of being the candidate of the Catholic Church that had made a deal with Seward, an incident of which would be the defeat of Lincoln for Senator and a division of the Illinois school fund.

[1] Wentworth to Herndon, Feb. 4, 1866. Weik MSS. This letter, marked 'Private' and written 'merely to oblige you [Herndon],' is a comparison of the careers of Lincoln, Douglas, Hardin, and Baker, as Wentworth observed the men from the time he went to Chicago in 1836. It is decidedly unfavorable to Lincoln.

When gathering material for his *Life of Lincoln*, Herndon had written several men who knew Lincoln, for their estimate of him. Wentworth's letter is one of the answers.

and head of the Cook County delegation to the State Convention at Springfield. Also, on this delegation was Charles L. Wilson, editor of the *Chicago Journal*, and a violent antagonist of the Mayor. As State Chairman, Judd knew and had great influence with most Republican politicians of the State nearly all of whom were delegates, and he hated Wentworth only less than he hated Douglas.

Thus the tall, capable, and picturesque scion of the Wentworth family comes into our drama; and thus Fate made his ambitions and plans, and the successful effort to defeat them, decisive elements in Lincoln's life and, of consequence, in American history. Lincoln, of course, knew of the scheme to thwart Wentworth, but that plotter must be given no warning:

'I suppose it is hardly necessary that any expression of preference for U.S. Senator, should be given at the county, or other local conventions and meetings,' Lincoln wrote to an anxious party worker. 'When the Republicans of the whole State get together at the State Convention, the thing will then be thought of, and something will or will not be done, according as the united judgment may dictate.' [1] Yet before the State Convention met, Republican conventions in all but five counties of Illinois had passed resolutions for Lincoln.[2]

June 16, 1858, was a 'lovely day' in Springfield. Jubilant throngs of Republicans filled the town. They were sure to win, they thought, and it was a happy crowd that filled the Hall of Representatives when the Convention was called to order. Nearly all counties were represented. As at other Republican Conventions, even the national gathering at Philadelphia two years earlier, no hard and fast rule was applied to credentials. All who came were welcomed, and the number of delegates were estimated to be between one thousand [3] and fifteen hundred,[4] the northern counties having sent excess delegations.[5]

All was harmony and enthusiasm.[6] At this very day and hour

[1] Lincoln to S. A. Hurlburt, Springfield, June 1, 1858. *Works*, II, 364–5.

[2] *Rockford Republican*, June 17, 1858.

[3] Browning's *Diary*, 327. June 16, 1858.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 17, 1858.

[5] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 17, 1858.

[6] Browning's *Diary*, 327.

our party 'is the most powerful party on the continent of North America,' boasted Richard Yates, the temporary chairman, in a speech suited to the occasion, and the crowd yelled. In reward for his exposure of Douglas's motives and appeal that the Republicans of Illinois hold fast, Gustave Koerner was made President of the Convention,[1] thus recognizing the German vote. He, too, made a rousing speech — the Republicans would win 'by an overwhelming majority.' Hurrah, shouted the believing delegates.[2]

Browning was selected as Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions and wrote the platform as he had done two years before at Bloomington.[3] 'A small caucus' in the State Library the night before the Convention met had directed the Quincy lawyer to prepare it.[4] Although Lincoln was there, Browning does not say so, nor does he make mention of Lincoln at any time when describing the Convention in his meticulous Diary.

The platform was cautious, some planks illogical. The Republican managers, intent on getting votes, had kept their ears to the ground. The voice of the people was for economic reforms, especially in the shape of largess from the National Government, and that voice was heeded. 'There is no subject before Congress of one half the national importance' as land grants to agricultural colleges, Trumbull was informed by the President of the Clark County Agricultural Society.[5] Workingmen and farmers, especially German emigrants, were eager for the enact-

[1] Koerner, II, 58. [2] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 18, 1858.

[3] 'I drafted the platform which was adopted without dissent.' Browning's *Diary*, 327.

[4] *Ib.*, June 15, 1858.

[5] John H. Kinnicutt to Trumbull, Northfield, Clark Co., Ill., Jan. 25, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

The agrarian movement, already discernible in 1854, had now become strong. About the time of the Republican State Convention, a great meeting of the farmers of Central Illinois passed stern resolutions against 'trading combinations,' banks, and railways for depressing prices and raising interest and freight rates; and urged the formation of a 'Farmer's Club' in every community, in order to strengthen the economic condition of farmers and raise them to that 'position among the classes of mankind . . . that nature destines them to occupy' and which they had not achieved because of 'their own neglect.' *Our Constitution*, June 26, 1858. Not a word did the farmers say about slavery.

Even stronger resolutions were adopted by a 'Farmers Congress' held at Centralia later in the year: 'the producing class should assert, not only their independence but their supremacy;' rules for trading, made by 'non-producers' were unfair, and laws framed and executed 'by lawyers' did not represent 'popular sentiment;' producers and

ment of a homestead law by which farms would be given out of the public domain to the landless.[1] Everybody wanted currency and banking reform,[2] internal improvements, and the building of the Pacific Railroad. Even hostility to slavery was put largely on economic grounds — the disadvantage of free labor in competition with slave labor.[3] Through all, of course, ran the moral element, not in the abstract, however, but in justification for material demands.

So the Republican platform combined all these elements. States' Rights must be upheld; in States where it existed, slavery must be let alone; our Government was 'instituted for free men,' and therefore public lands must be 'wrested' from speculators and greedy corporations and given to 'actual settlers;' the rights of free labor must be maintained, and, of consequence, rivers and harbors must be improved and the Pacific Railroad built; because 'we now compete in the markets of the country against the products of unpaid labor at depreciating prices,' it was 'eminently unjust' that the Administration should, 'by coercion' try to extend slavery into the Territories, or 'by patronage' should perpetuate it in the States; the Administration was 'recreant' to its 'trusts' because it had corruptly tried to carry out the purpose of the Kansas-Nebraska Act by forcing the Lecompton Constitution on an unwilling people; the Government must do all it could to suppress the slave trade; the Dred Scott decision announced the 'political heresy' that the Constitution carried slavery into the Territories; Congress was sovereign over the Territories and should keep 'the curse of slavery' out of them so as to preserve the

consumers must be brought closer together; to that end 'wholesale purchasing and selling agencies' must be established in 'the great centers of commerce,' etc. *Rockford Register*, Oct. 16, 1858. Again nothing was said about slavery.

For an understanding of the campaigns of 1858 and 1860, too much emphasis cannot be put on the agrarian and labor movements. They were phases of that economic development which became so conspicuous after the war, had much to do with pre-war elections, and greatly influenced Lincoln.

[1] T. Canisius, Alton, Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 26, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[2] Same to same, Dec. 8, 1857. *Ib.*

[3] 'The free white laboring class is the chief bulwark of our political freedom. . . . Our National Territories are their natural and rightful inheritance, from which the ruinous and degrading competition of slave labor ought to be excluded.' *Quincy Whig*, June 3, 1858.

public domain for 'free men and free labor;' slavery was a 'municipal regulation, without any extraterritorial operation,' and 'no power on earth can carry and maintain slavery in the States against the will of their people;' the Government should keep friendly relations with all nations and 'enter into entangling alliances with none;' but injuries to Americans on the high seas must be 'redressed;' public expenses must be cut and 'radical reform' made in national finances.[1] Since the Know-Nothing or American vote must be had at all costs, and since the Germans had been placated by Koerner's elevation, the party declarations for tolerance made at Bloomington and Philadelphia two years earlier were now omitted.

Such was the Illinois Republican platform of 1858 on which Lincoln stood in his fight with Douglas. It proved, said the Republican organ that the party was not merely 'sectional,' as its opponents maliciously called it.[2] But Illinois was not yet a manufacturing State and no mention of the tariff was made; to have done so might have scared off former Democrats. For the present, the protective tariff appeal was left to the East. Huh! sneered the *State Register*, about the Republican plank on protecting Americans on the ocean; Lincoln would want to know the identical spot where they had been molested before he would act, just as he had done in the Mexican War.[3]

But two nominations for State Offices were to be made and these were quickly disposed of. Then came the nomination of Lincoln according to the plans which the managers had carefully made. A dramatic manœuvre prepared the way. The Chicago delegation brought in a banner inscribed 'COOK COUNTY IS FOR ABRAHAM LINCOLN;' the crowd cheered wildly; a Peoria delegate moved that the motto be changed to 'ILLINOIS IS FOR ABRAHAM LINCOLN;' hurrahs of approval 'fairly shook' the State House.[4] In this fashion the enemies of 'long John in Chicago thought

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 17, 1858. The plank on protection of Americans on the ocean was caused by general public anger at the seizure of American vessels by British ships in suppressing the African slave trade. Why not suppress Spain, asked the *New York Herald*, clipped in *Illinois Daily State Register*, May 29, 1858.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 17, 1858.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 19, 1858.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 17, 1858; *Chicago Tribune*, June 18, 1858.

they had put a nail in his coffin . . . and . . . killed off his Senatorial aspirations,' remarked the *Chicago Times*, and added: 'We'll see if Long John is to be beaten or not.' [1] But the trick worked, and beaten Long John was.

After a formal endorsement of Trumbull was added to the platform, Charles L. Wilson submitted the following resolution which was greeted with shouts of approval and unanimously adopted:

'Resolved that Abraham Lincoln is the first and only choice of the Republicans of Illinois for the United States Senate, as the successor of Stephen A. Douglas.' [2] It was 'passed more for the object of closing down upon this everlasting croaking about Wentworth,' Lincoln modestly explained to Trumbull.[3] But 'EVERY MAN FOR LINCOLN,' was part of the caption over the story of the Convention printed in the leading anti-Wentworth paper.[4]

When the news reached Washington that Lincoln had been nominated, Douglas said to his close friend, John W. Forney: 'I shall have my hands full. He is the strong man of his party — full of wit, facts, dates — and the best stump speaker, with his droll ways and dry jokes, in the West. He is as honest as he is shrewd, and if I beat him my victory will be hardly won.' [5]

Seemingly to placate Greeley, some Republican who knew that Lincoln was to be nominated, wrote a long letter to the New York *Tribune*, the day before the Convention met. It stated that Lincoln had been made the Republican standard bearer, compared him with Douglas, and recounted their speeches at Springfield in 1854, all in disparagement of Douglas. Lincoln, of course, was highly praised and a valuable description given of his manner on the stump. 'Lincoln is colloquial, affable, good-natured, almost jolly. He states the case at issue with so much easy good humor and fairness that his opponents are almost persuaded he is not an opponent at all.' Yet all the time he is making a conclusive argument. 'Sometimes, for a single sen-

[1] *Chicago Daily Times*, June 22, 1858.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, June 17, 1858.

[3] Lincoln to Trumbull, Springfield, June 23, 1858. Tracy, 87–8.

[4] *Chicago Tribune*, June 18, 1858.

[5] *Anecdotes of Public Men:* John W. Forney, II, 179.

tence, he might seem to warm into eloquence, but it seemed only the leading of the subject, and not from any purpose to make a speech.' Decidedly, Lincoln, 'in the Senate, will be the right man in the right place.' [1]

After the platform was adopted and Lincoln nominated, the Convention, in great good humor, adjourned to eight o'clock that night. He then delivered his celebrated house-divided speech. Assured that the Convention would make him the Republican standard bearer, Lincoln had taken great pains to write out what he had to say. On envelopes and bits of paper he jotted down points when he thought of them and stored the scraps in his hat. Finally he transcribed these passages in consecutive order, 'carefully revising every line and sentence,' testifies Herndon. While thus at work on his speech, Dubois came into the office and asked Lincoln what he was writing: 'It's something you may see or hear some time,' he answered, 'but I'll not let you see it now.' [2]

When, at last, Lincoln got his speech in shape, he locked the office door, pulled the curtain across the glass panel, and read the production to the junior partner. As we have seen, Herndon was the radical influence in Lincoln's life, always urging him to take advanced stands against the advice of more cautious friends. '*I will do all I can to hold the leader's hands up*,' Herndon had written to Parker when Lincoln was preparing this very speech.[3]

At the end of each paragraph the prospective candidate paused for his partner's comment. When Lincoln read the first passage containing the celebrated Biblical quotation, Herndon remarked that it was true, of course, but was it 'wise or politic to say so?'

Gravely Lincoln made answer: 'that expression is a truth of all human experience, "a house divided against itself cannot

[1] Correspondence New York *Tribune* from Collinsville, Ill., June 15, 1858, in issue June 26, 1858.

[2] Herndon, II, 397.

[3] Herndon to Parker, Springfield, June 1, 1858. Newton, 164–5. Italics Herndon's. 'We, the Republicans, out here are comparing hands, seeing how we feel and stand, so that we may go into the "great battle" of 1858–9 in Illinois, between *Slavery and Freedom, Douglas and Lincoln, Democracy and Republicanism. . . . I will do all I can to hold the leader's hands up.*'

stand." . . . The proposition also is true, and has been for six thousand years. I want to use some universally known figure expressed in simple language as universally well-known, that may strike home to the minds of men in order to raise them up to the peril of the times. I do not believe I would be right in changing or omitting it. I would rather be defeated with this expression in the speech, and uphold and discuss it before the people, than be victorious without it.' [1]

A day or two before the Convention met, Lincoln asked several friends to go over the speech with him in the State Library, a usual precaution of candidates and of all wise public speakers. Not one approved, most objected, one predicted that it would drive former Democrats back to their old party, another said flatly that it was a 'damned fool utterance.' But Herndon 'held the leader's hands up,' as he had told Parker he would do: 'Lincoln, deliver that speech as read and it will make you President,' he exclaimed. Slowly Lincoln rose, and telling the group what 'intense thought' he had given to the whole subject, thus brought the conference to an end:

'Friends, this thing has been retarded long enough. The time has come when these sentiments should be uttered; and if it is decreed that I should go down because of this speech, then let me go down linked to the truth — let me die in the advocacy of what is just and right.' [2]

When the expectant delegates and spectators again crowded Representatives Hall that night, Lincoln read his speech just as he had written it. Like Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, or Washington's Farewell Address, or Marshall's greatest opinions, Lincoln's speech contained nothing that had not been said often before. Time and again every idea had been expressed, sometimes in the same terms that Lincoln now made use of.

[1] Herndon, II, 398.

[2] *Ib.*, 399–400. One of the men present was Dr. William Jayne who, fifty years afterward, when over eighty years of age, gave substantially the same version of Lincoln's remarks that Herndon gave, but in pompous and verbose language. Jayne makes Lincoln repeat six verses of poetry, quote St. Paul, cite the example of Martin Luther, etc. The Jayne account is wholly unlike Lincoln's plain and simple manner of speaking at this period in his life and it is hard to imagine any politician boring a company of other politicians in a serious political conference with poetical recitations and unctuous sermonizing. *Abraham Lincoln:* William Jayne, 42–3, quoted in Newton, 171–2.

The opening sentence was a paraphrase of that spoken by Webster when beginning his second reply to Hayne, and other words of Webster's were employed in Lincoln's peroration. The proposition that the Nation could not exist half slave and half free had been stated hundreds of times in the press and on the stump, North and South alike. Lincoln himself frankly admitted that the idea had been impressed upon him by reading the editorials of the *Richmond Enquirer* already quoted.[1] The 'house divided' passage was a favorite Biblical quotation which he had repeated many years before. Moreover, those exact words, applied to slavery in the United States, had been in common use for at least half a century.[2] All the arguments against the Dred Scott decision had recently been made in various forms in the Senate.

But like Washington, Jefferson, and Marshall, Lincoln stated old truths in a simpler form than any one else had expressed them; like those masters, he stated them when the public mind was intent upon them and impressive numbers of men and women were ready to receive them; and he stated them as the chosen leader of a young, powerful and growing party in a great Western State at a critical time and as the opponent selected by that party to do battle with the then strongest political man in the Nation.

Thus Lincoln's speech, to which we now are to listen, had all

[1] *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 267.

[2] 'A house divided against itself cannot stand; neither can a government or Constitution: This is coincident with the present Chief Magistrate's [Jefferson's] opinion in his notes on the State of Virginia,' etc. *Remarks on the Slavery of the Black People:* John Parrish, Philadelphia, 1806.

'Our system of government rests on the broad basis of the people. . . . The people are not homogeneous, they do not assimilate; they are opposed in interests, at variance in opinion — they are at war, unavoidable war. . . . The cement is broken. The house is divided against itself,' etc. *The Rightful Remedy* [secession]: Edward B. Bryan, Charleston, S.C., 1850.

'The permanence of the Union is predicable only upon one of two conditions, either the South must put an end to slavery or the North must adopt it.' New York *Tribune*, 1854, as quoted in *Life of Charles A. Dana:* James H. Wilson, 129–30.

'Resolved, That a Church or Government which accords the same rights and privileges to Slavery as to Liberty, is a house divided against itself, which cannot stand.' Resolutions American Anti-Slavery Society, May 9, 1855. Garrison, III, 420.

For these citations I am indebted to Professor Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Michigan. They are examples of great numbers of others in use long before the abolition movement became general up to the end of the Civil War.

the elements that make human utterance enduring. Had Webster not been in the Senate when Hayne made his attack on the Union, had that subject not then been emergent and vital, the grand eloquence of the Massachusetts orator would have been absurd. As a private citizen, Jefferson might have written a thousand Declarations at his home in Virginia, as many a man had done, but they never would have been heard of; as the draughtsman of the Continental Congress at the hour of Revolution, however, he wrote with the pen of history and undying fame.

So when the angular and homely clad Lincoln arose by the table in the Hall of the House of Representatives on that June night, and stood before the cheering multitude, he was the spokesman of a cause, and great events, still in the future, were to make his words historic. Lincoln read his speech,[1] slowly, with frequent emphasis on particular words, which he had carefully underscored in his manuscript. For some reason these italics, which Lincoln took great pains to keep in print when he read the proof and which were printed in the *Illinois State Journal* just as Lincoln had inserted them, are left out of his published works. He also made his paragraphs very short, often of but one sentence, and even these sentences, sometimes of only six words, each of one syllable.[2] Let us, then, follow Lincoln's speech as he delivered it and as it was published, under his direction, in the Republican organ at Springfield.

'If we could first know *where* we are, and *whither* we are tending, we could then better judge *what* to do, and *how* to do it,' began Lincoln with, for him, unwonted gravity.

'We are now far into the *fifth* year, since a policy was initiated, with the *avowed* object, and *confident* promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.[3]

[1] Horace White, in Herndon and Weik, second edition, II, 92. 'I sat at a short distance from Mr. Lincoln when he delivered . . . the speech. . . . This was delivered from manuscript, and was the only one I ever heard him deliver in that way.'

White, then twenty-four years old, was on the *Chicago Tribune* which had sent him to write up the Springfield Convention. He was assigned to go with Lincoln throughout the campaign, and it is to Mr. White's narrative, written many years afterward but from notes taken at the time, that we owe the fairest account given by a spectator.

[2] In all *Works* of Lincoln these small paragraphs are combined into long ones.

[3] Webster's first sentence of his reply to Hayne is: 'When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather, and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of

'Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, *not ceased*, but has *constantly augmented*.

'In *my* opinion, it *will* not cease, until a *crisis* shall have been reached, and passed ——

'"A house divided against itself cannot stand."

'I believe this government cannot endure; permanently half *slave* and half *free*.

'I do not expect the Union to be *dissolved* — I do [no]t expect the house to *fall* — but I *do* expect it will cease to be divided.

'It will become *all* one thing, or *all* the other.

'Either the *opponents* of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction; or its *advocates* will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in *all* the States, *old* as well as *new* — *North* as well as *South*.

'Have we no *tendency* to the latter condition?'

With this foundation of enquiry laid, Lincoln went on to argue that, from the repeal of the Missouri Compromise up to and including the Dred Scott decision and Buchanan's present Kansas policy, every Democratic measure had been a part of a plan devised long before these attempts were made to carry it out — all constituted a smoothly working 'piece of *machinery*': could any one fail 'to trace the evidences of design, and concert of action, among its chief bosses, from the beginning.'

First came the doctrine of the '*sacred right of self government*' by which the Kansas-Nebraska Act was justified, which doctrine in that case meant no more than this: 'That if any *one* man choose to enslave *another*, no *third* man shall be allowed to object.' That was proved, said Lincoln, by the fate of an amendment offered in the Senate to make specific the language in which the principle of popular sovereignty was stated in the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

That language was: '*It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, not exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.*' Yet an

the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude, and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course.' *Writings:* VI, 3.

amendment that the people might exclude slavery had been beaten by the friends of the bill.[1]

At the very time that the Kansas-Nebraska bill was 'passing' through Congress at Washington, Lincoln continued, the Dred Scott case was 'passing' through the Federal Court at St. Louis; and 'both Nebraska bill and law suit were brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854.' Lincoln then proceeded to make the usual Republican argument to which we have listened, but he made it in plainer terms. The argument in the Supreme Court before the Presidential election; the postponement of the decision until after that event, so that the victory of Buchanan could be claimed as an endorsement of the misused principle of popular sovereignty; the assertion of Douglas in the Senate in answer to a question by Trumbull, that the Supreme Court must decide whether the people of a Territory could prohibit slavery; the repeated assertion of Pierce in his last message to Congress that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional (an assertion which, as we have seen, Lincoln ignored when making answer to Pierce at the time); the ordering of a reargument of the Dred Scott case after Buchanan's election; the exhortation by the new President in his inaugural for 'the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, *whatever it might be;*' the decision itself; Douglas's quick endorsement of it following that of the President; Douglas's declaration, in the course of his 'squabble' with Buchanan over the Lecompton Constitution,

[1] This was the famous Chase amendment to the Kansas-Nebraska Act. It was a purely political manœuvre, as amendments to bills often are, designed to make 'records' for campaign uses and put the other party, seemingly, in the wrong. Senator Pearce of Maryland instantly offered to amend Chase's amendment so as to permit the people to admit or reject slavery as they saw fit, thus making it 'perfectly fair,' as Pearce said, and consistent with the language of the bill.

But the parliamentary situation was such that the proposal of a further amendment to an amendment could not be received; Chase had taken advantage of that fact, a permissible feint and one made use of constantly at the present day; and in this state of things in the Senate, Chase's amendment was, of course, voted down. Undoubtedly it would have been defeated anyway, as hostile amendments from the opposing party always are rejected by the party proposing a bill and responsible for it, especially if it is a 'party measure.'

Chase knew that his amendment would suffer this usual fate, but he also knew that the defeat of it would make 'a record' from which party appeals could be make in the press and on the stump. This took place, and we shall hear Lincoln made frequent use of the incident in his debates with Douglas. It is for this reason that this explanation is given, since on its merits, the whole matter does not deserve a word of comment.

'that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he *cares* not whether slavery be voted *down* or voted *up*.'

There you have it: 'The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its *present* state of advancement.' Lincoln then described what he called 'the *working* points of that machinery:' the decision that a negro could not be a '*citizen*' of any State, made for the purpose of depriving him of the constitutional guarantee that 'the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States;' the decision that slavery could not be kept out of the Territories, made for the purpose of enabling slaveholders to '*fill up* the territories with slaves, . . . and thus to enhance the chances of *permanency* to the institution through all the future;' the refusal to decide whether residence in a free State made a slave free, and whether the decision that such questions must be determined by 'the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master.'

Why that curious ruling? Lincoln thus explained the hidden purposes of it: 'This point is made, not to be pressed *immediately;* but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently *indorsed* by the people at an election, *then* to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other *one*, or one *thousand* slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.'

And the people were to be led to agree to just that: the plot was to make use of 'the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, . . . to *educate* and *mould* public opinion, at least *Northern* public opinion, to not *care* whether slavery is voted *down* or voted *up*.

'This shows exactly where we now *are;* and *partially* also, whither we are tending.'

With the emphasis of brief reiteration which only the artist of public speech can employ with good effect, Lincoln asked his hearers to review again 'the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will *now* appear less *dark* and *mysterious* than they did *when* they were transpiring.'

Take, for instance, the doctrine that 'the people were to be

left "perfectly free [to form and regulate their domestic institutions] subject only to the Constitution." What the *Constitution* had to do with it, outsiders could not *then* see. Plainly enough *now*, it was an exactly fitted *nitch*, for the Dred Scott decision to afterwards come in, and declare that *perfect freedom* of the people, to be just no freedom at all.'

All could now see why the Chase amendment had been voted down. 'Plainly enough *now*, the adoption of it, would have spoiled the nitch for the Dred Scott decision.' Lincoln was here making a popular appeal, of course, not a legal argument, since the adoption of the Chase amendment could not have prevented the Supreme Court from deciding the Dred Scott case as it did.

'Why was the court decision held up . . . till *after* the Presidential election?' continued Lincoln. 'Plainly enough *now*, the speaking out *then* would have damaged the "*perfectly free*" argument upon which the election was to be carried.'

Pierce's endorsement of the decision long before its delivery, the delay of the reargument, Buchanan's '*advance* exhortation' — these things, said Lincoln, '*look* like the cautious *patting* and *petting* a spirited horse, preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall.'

Here was a comparison that the farmers of Illinois could understand, and Lincoln now gave another which they and everybody else could understand. No more adroit appeal to the popular mind could be made, and this fact, together with the subject, the occasion, and Lincoln's post-war fame, have given this passage a place in literature:

'We can not absolutely *know* that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen — Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance [1] — and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few — not omitting even scaffolding — or, if a

[1] Douglas, Pierce, Taney, and Buchanan.

single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in — in *such* a case, we find it impossible to not *believe* that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common *plan* or *draft* drawn up before the first lick was struck.'

In the debates, we shall hear how Douglas made answer to this seemingly unanswerable reasoning.

Was there a place in the frame for another piece of timber? Of course — the Kansas-Nebraska Act said that 'the people of a *State* as well as *Territory*, were to be left "*perfectly free . . . subject only to the Constitution.*"'

'Why mention a *State*?' asked Lincoln. 'They were legislating for *territories*, and not *for* or *about* States. Certainly the people of a *State* are and *ought to be* subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this *lugged* into this merely *territorial* law? Why are the people of a *territory* and the people of a *state* therein *lumped* together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being *precisely* the same?

'While the opinion of *the Court*, by Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring Judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a Territorial legislature to exclude slavery from any United States territory, they all *omit* to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a *state*, or the people of a State, to exclude it. . . .

'In what *cases* the power of the *states is so* restrained by the U.S. Constitution is left an *open* question, precisely as the same question, as to the restraint on the power of the *territories*, was left open in the Nebraska act. Put *that* and *that* together, and we have another nice little nitch, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a *state* to exclude slavery from its limits.

'And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted *down*, or voted *up*," shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.'

In short, according to Lincoln, the Supreme Court stood ready to make another Dred Scott decision to extend slavery into the free States, when it should be thought safe to do so. The contention that such a decision would be rendered, forbidding States to exclude slavery, was a favorite point with Lincoln, and we shall hear him make it over and over in his debate with Douglas and hear Douglas's repeated reply to it.

'Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States,' Lincoln continued.

'Welcome or unwelcome, such decision *is* probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown.

'We shall *lie down* pleasantly dreaming that the people of *Missouri* are on the verge of making their State *free;* and we shall *awake* to the *reality*, instead, that the *Supreme* Court has made *Illinois* a *slave* State.

'To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty, is the work now before all those who would prevent consummation.

'That is *what* we have to do.

'But *how* can we best do it?'

Thus, at last, Lincoln reached the point from which he could logically attack Douglas directly and by name. Throughout he had intimated that his opponent was the chief devil, but now he could unmask him. In doing so, he made use of the device, sometimes adopted by lawyers to minimize the arguments of opposing counsel by overpraising that counsel and depreciating himself, thus inclining the jury to favor him — a method that Lincoln is to employ throughout his debates with Douglas. This part of Lincoln's speech must be given in his own words:

'There are those who denounce us *openly* to their *own* friends, and yet whisper *us softly*, that *Senator Douglas* is the *aptest* instrument there is, with which to effect that object. *They* do *not* tell us, nor has *he* told us, that he *wishes* any such object to be effected. They wish us to *infer* all, from the fact that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us, on a single point, upon which, he and we have never differed.

'They remind us that *he* is a very *great man*, and that the

largest of *us* are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a *living dog* is better than a *dead lion*." Judge Douglas, if not a *dead* lion *for this work*, is at least a *caged* and *toothless* one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He don't *care* anything about it. His avowed *mission is impressing* the "public heart" to *care* nothing about it.

'A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas' superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave trade.

'Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he *really* think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a *sacred right* of white men to take negro slaves into the new territories. Can he possibly show that it is *less* a sacred right to *buy* them where they can be bought cheapest? And, unquestionably they can be bought *cheaper in Africa* than in *Virginia*.

'He had done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere *right of property;* and as such, how can *he* oppose the foreign slave trade — how can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free" — unless he does it as a *protection* to the home production? And as the home *producers* will probably not *ask* the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

'Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be *wiser to-day* than [he] was *yesterday* — that he may rightfully *change* when he finds himself wrong.

'But, can we for that reason, run ahead, and *infer* that he *will* make any particular change, of which he, himself, has given no intimation? Can we *safely* base *our* action upon any such *vague* inference?

'Now, as ever, I wish to not *misrepresent* Judge Douglas' *position*, question his *motives*, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him.

'Whenever, *if ever*, he and we can come together on *principle* so that *our great cause* may have assistance from *his great ability*, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle.

'But clearly, he is not *now* with us — he does not *pretend* to be — he does not *promise* to *ever* be.

'Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by its own undoubted friends — those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work — who *do care* for the result.

'Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong.

'We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us.

'Of *strange, discordant,* and even, *hostile* elements, we gathered from the four winds, and *formed* and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud, and pampered enemy.

'Did we brave all *then* to *falter* now? — *now* — when that same enemy is *wavering,* dissevered and belligerent? [1]

'The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail — if we stand firm, we shall not fail.

'*Wise councils* may *accelerate* or *mistakes delay* it, but, sooner or later the victory is *sure* to come.' [2]

Other speakers followed and the convention adjourned amid the 'wildest enthusiasm.' [3] Lincoln gave his manuscript to young White and asked him to read the proof of it at the *State Journal* office where it was already in type. While the youthful reporter was at the task, Lincoln 'came into the composing room . . . and looked over the revised proofs,' White relates. 'He said to me that he had taken a great deal of pains with this speech, and that he wanted it to go before the people just as he had prepared it. He added that some of his friends had scolded him a good deal about the opening paragraph and the "house divided against itself," and wanted him to change it or leave it out altogether, but that he believed he had studied this subject more deeply than they had, and that he was going to stick to that text, whatever happened.' [4]

[1] The famous sentence in Webster's peroration is: 'When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on . . . States dissevered, discordant, belligerent.'

Lincoln's application of this to the Democratic factions in Illinois accurately stated the situation, notwithstanding his use of the seemingly inconsistent words 'wavering' and 'belligerent,' a fact which fully answers the criticism that those words convey antagonistic ideas.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Journal,* June 18, 1858. All italics Lincoln's.

[3] Koerner, II, 58–9.

[4] White, in Herndon and Weik, 2nd edition, II, 92.

The larger Republican papers of Illinois printed Lincoln's speech in full; smaller ones published the most striking passages from it. The Republican State Committee circulated it in pamphlet form where it would do most good. Here and there a country editor got out a pocket edition of it.[1] The *Chicago Tribune*[2] called it 'masterly,' 'statesmanlike,' 'the ground work of the campaign,' and praised Lincoln's 'dignified and gentlemanly bearing towards Mr. Douglas.' Even Parker was pleased with Lincoln — his speech was 'admirable' and he would win, for Douglas was now 'neither Republican nor Democrat.'[3]

Under the caption, REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES, the New York *Tribune*[4] reproduced the whole speech with a brief editorial of cordial praise — it was 'compact and forcible,' 'concise and admirable,' and 'one of his best efforts.'[5] Thereafter, Greeley ceased to urge Illinois Republicans to support Douglas — indeed, he had stopped doing so a fortnight before the meeting of the Republican State Convention at Springfield. Herndon had sent Greeley scolding letters of protest. 'Paddle your own dugout,' exclaimed the New York editor at the end of a sharp note in reply.[6] But other papers outside Illinois paid little or no attention to Lincoln's speech.[7] It was, however, his most important move in the game for the Presidency, a game Lincoln meant to win.[8]

The Douglas press scoffed at Lincoln's speech: how like Lincoln to call Douglas a '*dead lion*,' and himself a '*living dog*' — and how appropriate that term as applied to himself, for, in Congress, had he not won and earned a dog's name 'Spot'?[9] 'To kill a *dead* lion, all the "living dogs" of Illinois have been let loose with sharpened fangs. To fight a "toothless" lion, all the

[1] For instance: Orville P. Bassett, publisher of the *True Republican*, Sycamore, Ill. A copy, probably unique, is in the Barrett Collection.

[2] June 19, 1858.

[3] Parker to Herndon, July 1, 1858. Newton, 177–8.

[4] June 24, 1858. [5] New York *Tribune*, June 24, 1858.

[6] Greeley to Herndon, New York, May 29, 1858. Newton, 164.

[7] Yet the New York correspondent of the *Chicago Press and Tribune*, in a partisan letter against Douglas, July 2, 1858, said that Lincoln's speech had been 'extensively published here and has commanded unqualified admiration.'

[8] 'While, however, his political friends were training him for the Senate he was coaching himself for the Presidency, two years thereafter.' *Lincoln:* Whitney, I, 266.

[9] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 1, 1858, quoting *Chicago Times*.

living dogs from Cairo to Chicago have been lashed and whipped into the hunt.' Was it a dead or a toothless lion that had attacked and beaten the Administration with all its patronage, backed by 'a proud and overbearing majority in both houses of Congress.' [1]

In even stronger and much graver terms Democratic editors denounced the speech as little short of treason, since, said they, it meant war. Throughout the campaign they made fun of Lincoln's comparison of Douglas and himself as a 'dead lion' and a 'living dog.' [2]

Wentworth's paper declared that all Douglas expected to accomplish was to cause a deadlock in the Legislature and throw the election over for two years, and said that the battlefield would be Central Illinois.[3]

Thus was the Republican campaign in that State formally opened, and we shall now see Lincoln, in his fiftieth year, make the first great fight of his life.

[1] *Chicago Daily Times*, June 23, 1858.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 28, 1858, and succeeding issues of that and other papers.

[3] *Chicago Daily Democrat*, June 18, 1858. 'The Republicans will sweep the North. The Democrats will sweep the South. Douglas hopes to get his balance of power in the centre of the State. He had made up his mind that the Republicans will help the Democrats in the South, and the Democrats will help the Republicans in the North, and that his only chance is to hold the balance of power, and throw the election over.'

CHAPTER IV

OPENING OF THE CAMPAIGN

The issues between Mr. Lincoln and myself, as respective candidates for the U.S. Senate, as made up, are direct, unequivocal, and irreconcilable. He goes for uniformity in our domestic institutions, for a war of sections, until one or the other shall be subdued. I go for the great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, the right of the people to decide for themselves. DOUGLAS at Chicago, July 9, 1858.

Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man, this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal. LINCOLN at Chicago, July 10, 1858.

PROMPTLY Douglas sounded his call to the colors. His postmaster at Chicago had been removed and a former occupant, Isaac Cook, put in his place. Cook, once a Douglas man, was a strong local politician who had not been reappointed because of shortage in his accounts.[1] The *Chicago Times*[2] printed the details of the defalcation, and, on the Senate floor, Douglas denounced him; but he was confirmed, and, with the two United States Marshals, managed the fight of the 'regular Democracy' or 'National Democracy' against Douglas. All other Federal officeholders who stood by the President and thus kept their places, together with the scores of those who had been appointed to offices from which Douglas men had been ousted, joined in the assault on the great party insurgent.[3]

Most active and resourceful of these was the special agent of the Post Office Department, who was also superintendent of mails, postmasters, and route agents in Illinois, Dr. Charles Leib, a Democratic clerk in the last session of the Illinois House of Representatives. He was appointed in the place of James Ward, who was removed because he would not desert Douglas, and Leib at once wired to the Republican Secretary of State:

[1] *Chicago Times*, March 9, 1858.

[2] *Ib.*, March 21, 1858. When news of Cook's appointment reached Chicago, the editor of the *Times* wrote the editor of the *Illinois State Register* that the 'town is upside down, and *if Douglas does not* . . . fight the nomination then, he for one, would cease to respect him.' James W. Sheahan, Chicago, to Lanphier, Feb. 19, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

[3] Sheahan, 385–90.

'I have Ward's place.' [1] Travelling on railroad passes, Leib was constantly going from place to place, coördinating the Administration forces, threatening removals, promising appointments and stirring up trouble for Douglas in every way.[2]

Moreover, he was a go-between for the 'regular Democrats' and the Republican leaders, and faithfully reported to Trumbull in Washington the progress of the fight. That Leib also told the Republican State Chairman what he was doing is certain, although this cannot be proved by written evidence, since Judd's papers have been destroyed. Of all this coöperation, however, Lincoln was in total ignorance, for we shall hear him say so time and again.

The Administration agent also conferred with local Republican editors and workers. Of this we have direct and positive proof. Delahay wrote a revealing account of one such conversation. 'Last night with Brown,[3] English,[4] and *Leib* (*Mail agent*) I spent several hours; *Leib* is drilling the faithful, and I of late, have made a few speaches, sort of Douglass, speaches. *Lincoln* and I went out to Edwardsville Tuesday together. Lincoln made a fine Republican speach. My speach did not please the Republicans, [but] by Brown and Lincoln, it was understood what I should say beforehand; my policy is to back up Douglass until after the Buckhanan convention nominate their *state* ticket, then I am for Lincoln.' [5]

[1] Leib to Hatch or Dubois (Republican State Auditor), March 2, 1858. *Chicago Daily Times*, March 7, 1858.

[2] When Leib was appointed to the place of a Douglas man, removed, Thos. L. Harris, Democratic Representative in the House from the Springfield District, wrote to the editor of the *Illinois State Register:* 'I hope the first time he gets into the State he will be tarred and feathered and sent out of it, down the Mississippi on a raft.' Harris to Lanphier ('Dear Charlie'), Washington, Feb. 27, 1858. Lanphier MSS. And see *Chicago Daily Times*, March 3, 1858.

[3] George T. Brown, Republican, editor of the *Alton Courier*.

[4] A local politician.

[5] M. W. Delahay, Alton, to Trumbull, May 22, 1858. Trumbull MSS. Of this incident Professor Cole says: 'Certain radical "black republicans" found endorsement of Douglas to be a valuable expedient to prevent the Buchanan men from harmonizing with the Douglas wing. M. W. Delahay, an Alton radical who bitterly hated Douglas, went on the stump for the "little giant" with the understanding of Lincoln and the republicans; he remained in the field until the Buchanan convention nominated its state ticket; then, according to arrangement, he came out for Lincoln.' *Era:* Cole, 166.

By far the best short account of the campaign of 1858 in Illinois is that of Professor

Indeed, unless human nature did not function within the Republican organization and unless the Republican managers refrained altogether from the usual campaign practices during the whole of the contest of 1858, there can be no doubt, that in order to beat Douglas, the Administration leaders and the Republican State Committee were in close touch from first to last.[1]

Therefore just before he left Washington to take the field in Illinois, Douglas rose in his place in the Senate and, with a boldness harsh even for him, denounced what he called the plot against him. He alleged that the purpose of it was to divide the Democratic Party in Illinois and elect Republicans to all offices including that of United States Senator. Leib, especially, was held up to execration and scorn. He had been a member of Lane's secret armed band of 'Danites' in Kansas, and, in 1856, had told Douglas that he once was 'grand paymaster' of that order, begging Douglas to overlook the fact (Leib was then seeking an appointment as a Democrat). This was that very organization which the Little Giant had 'exposed' in his report on Kansas, made to the Senate that year. And now, Douglas said, he found himself faced by 'an unscrupulous coalition' of Republicans and 'Danite' Democrats, the most active agent of which was this same Leib. Trumbull denied it — Leib 'is no man of ours,' he said.[2]

Cole, in Chapter VII of his brilliant volume. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that Professor Cole's narrative is the only impartial treatment of the subject.

[1] When Leib secured this appointment early in 1858, the editor of the *Chicago Times* wrote to Lanphier: 'The object of this is to build up an anti-Douglas party and Leib is to be a travelling incendiary stirring up postmasters, etc. . . . We have a hard fight on hand; I do not know what the result will be.' James W. Sheahan, Chicago, to Lanphier, Feb. 4, 1858. Lanphier MSS.

'*That which is likely to defeat the Republican partisans is the coalition between them and the Lecompton office-holders.* The people will have none of that.' *Cincinnati Commercial* (Rep.). 'We know that all the federal office-holders of Illinois . . . boast that they have made an alliance with the Republicans,' etc. Comment of the *Chicago Daily Times*, May 25, 1858. Italics *Times'*.

[2] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. III, 3055–8. June 15, 1858. The *Illinois Daily State Register*, June 25, 1858, and other Douglas papers printed this speech in full. It was fine Douglas campaign material.

'I will charge the alliance, and I will prove the alliance. Yes, I could here, in the Senate, if I could make witnesses speak, prove that this man, Leib, went to the other side [Republican] of the Chamber, and appealed to them to vote for the confirmation of a certain officer in Illinois, in order to help the Republicans beat Douglas.' *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. III, 3058. June 15, 1858.

Neither Trumbull, nor any other Republican Senator, made denial. See political report of Leib to Trumbull *infra*.

In alarm, Trumbull wrote to Lincoln of Douglas's charge. 'We had already seen, by telegraph, a report of Douglas' general onslaught upon everybody but himself,' Lincoln made answer. He reassured Trumbull, saying that there was no 'alliance between the Republicans and Buchanan men in this State,' unless pleasure at the Democratic split and doing nothing to prevent it, could be called so; but there had been no bargain of any kind.[1] Obviously, however, Lincoln was perturbed, for he read this letter to his junior partner, and Herndon promptly wrote to Trumbull also:

'I adopt all he [Lincoln] said. . . . I know of no such contract finished, commenced or in embryo. I think I would know it . . . probably sooner and better than Lincoln, for you know he does not know the details of how we get along. I do, but he does not. That kind of thing does not suit his tastes, nor does it suit me, yet I am compelled to do it — do it because I cannot get rid of it.'[2] Strange man was the junior partner and indispensable to Lincoln's progress — friend of Parker, Phillips, and the Eastern radicals, and associate of Illinois Abolitionists, and yet drill sergeant of 'the wild boys about town;'[3] also the member of the firm who had to do things he did not like but could not 'get rid of.' Old Onstot's cryptic statement, that Lincoln had 'reasons' for making Herndon his partner, was not without meaning.

At any rate, the Democratic quarrel gave Lincoln his chief hope. Writing at the time, Herndon testifies: 'Mr. Lincoln was here a moment or so since, and he told me that he had just seen Col. Dougherty [Administration Democratic candidate for State Treasurer], and had a conversation with him. He told Lincoln that the National Democracy intended "to run in every County and District a National Democrat for each and every office." Lincoln replied to this by saying — "If you do this the thing is settled — the battle is fought." This you may depend upon,' Herndon assured Trumbull.[4]

[1] Lincoln, Springfield, to Trumbull, June 23, 1858. Tracy, 87.

[2] Herndon, Springfield, to Trumbull, June 24, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] See Vol. II, Chap. III.

[4] Herndon, Springfield, to Trumbull, July 8, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

The Administration Democrats were in desperate earnest, — 'the split widens and deepens daily: . . . *I know*,' Herndon goes on, because 'my position — remember where

'Mr. Douglas has tremendous odds against him,' said the New York *Times*. 'If Mr. Douglas shall succeed in detaching from the Administration Democrats enough to elect him, it will be the most brilliant triumph of his life.' [1] And a Republican paper of Cincinnati declared that the 'critical position' of Douglas made his fight for reëlection desperate and fateful.[2]

His denunciation of the 'alliance' made, Douglas started for Chicago, stopping in New York on the way in order to raise campaign funds from Tammany, the Republicans said,[3] and to arrange with Seward for help in return for Douglas's support of the New York Senator for President — campaign canards without the faintest evidence to support them, and of interest only because they were two of the many stories told against Douglas in the historic fight between him and Lincoln now at hand. Scenes on his trip to the West were the reverse of those of four years earlier. Everywhere the people now begged to see and hear him. His entry into Chicago was a triumph. All press correspondents reported it in highly colored language. He was received 'like a conquering hero,' wrote one of the most trustworthy and moderate of them.[4]

A Committee of Douglas Democrats met him at Michigan City, Indiana, and at every stop from that place to Chicago Douglas received an ovation. Newspaper men were hard put to it to find words to describe the demonstration at that city. The Republican press tried to belittle it, but grudgingly admitted its success, albeit it was all 'cooked up,' they said. Six horses drew the carriage in which Douglas rode from the station to the

my father and Bro[ther] stand — is such that I know what I am talking about.' Trumbull MSS. Herndon's father and brother were strong Buchanan men.

[1] New York *Times*, July 13, 1858.

[2] *Cincinnati Commercial*, July 6, 1858.

[3] In the heat of the campaign, the *Chicago Tribune*, Sept. 10, 1858, charged that about three weeks before a Douglas emissary got a promise from Tammany to contribute $50,000 to his campaign fund. This charge must be considered with relation to the results of the panic and the frenzy of the campaign. Absurd as it was, the story was thought to be effective political ammunition at a time when both parties considered any tale legitimate that might hurt the other side.

[4] Henry Villard, correspondent *New York Staats-Zeitung*. *Memoirs of Henry Villard*, I, 92. Young Villard also sent letters gratuitously to the *Philadelphia Press* throughout the Lincoln-Douglas campaign. *Ib.*, 91 *n.* Villard was twenty-three years old at this time.

Tremont House. The streets were so densely packed that way could be made but slowly through the throngs. The roar of cannon was unbroken. Continuous cheers arose. Frenzied men strove to reach the carriage and shake Douglas's hand. From the windows 'fair ladies' waved handkerchiefs, and their voices mingled with the deeper roars of welcome. 'Chicago has never before witnessed such a sight.' [1] The fighting spirit among his followers was aroused, for Douglas, the fighter, had come home to lead them.

In spite of the self-suppression of his opinion after the Illinois Republicans had rejected his advice, Greeley could not restrain his pen when the telegraph flashed to New York descriptions of Douglas's reception. 'The vast assemblage . . . was a well deserved' tribute to Douglas: if expediency had influenced him to fight the Administration and its Kansas policy, he had displayed 'rare and profound sagacity;' while if he had been inspired by principle he had earned still higher praise. In any case, the sole credit would be due to Douglas if the Democratic party was saved from utter wreck.[2]

When Douglas stepped on to the balcony of the hotel to make his speech, more than twelve thousand people stood before him in the street below — the Douglas papers said thirty thousand.[3] Again and again the cheering broke out. Douglas asked for quiet. Finally he began. He was very tired and he spoke without written preparation or even notes.

Such a reception, 'so great in numbers that no human voice can be heard to its countless thousands,' was the public endorsement of a great principle and not a tribute to him, said Douglas. '[Voices, "It is!" "You have deserved it," and great applause.]' No! he exclaimed; 'It is an expression of your devotion to that great principle of self-government [cries of "hear," "hear"] to which my life for many years past has been and in the whole future will be devoted. [Immense cheering.]'

Douglas said that he had fought the Lecompton Constitution,

[1] *Chicago Times*, July 10, 1858, as quoted in Sheahan, 398–400.

[2] New York *Tribune*, July 12, 1858, clipped in *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 21, 1858.

[3] Estimate of *Chicago Times*, July 10, 1858, and *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 12, 1858.

because it violated that principle, and, with others, he had 'forced them' to send it back to Kansas to be voted on by the people next August. So that subject was now out of the way. '[Immense applause.]' Senator Crittenden, some 'glorious Americans and old line whigs from the south,' and the Republicans had joined him in the fight and deserved as much credit as he. He had defended the principle of popular sovereignty right there in Chicago in the face of 'great dissatisfaction, [Shame! Shame!]' and the Legislature, chosen immediately thereafter, had endorsed that principle. Had he not done his duty in fighting for that same principle again? '[Cries of "yes!" "yes!" and cheers.]' In the Senate he had once fought for it against opposition from the North, and recently against resistance from the South. '[Cheers.]' Everywhere he had pledged himself to do that; 'Have I not redeemed that pledge? [cries of "yes!" "yes!" and three tremendous cheers.]'

He wished to be frank, Douglas said. He had attacked the Lecompton constitution not because it had slavery in it, but solely because the whole instrument was not to be submitted to the people. It would have been the same had a free-State plan been offered in the same way. 'I deny their [Congress] right to force a good thing upon a people who are unwilling to receive it [cries of "good!" "good!" and cheers].' That was the meaning of popular sovereignty.

It is 'the great principle upon which all our institutions rest. It is no answer to this argument to say that slavery is an evil and hence should not be tolerated. . . . You allow them [the people] to decide for themselves whether they desire a Maine liquor law or not; . . . what kind of common schools they will have; . . . the relations between husband and wife parent and child, and guardian and ward; in fact, . . . all other questions, and why not upon this question? [Cheers.]'

Here Douglas went out of his way to compliment Lincoln. 'I take great pleasure in saying that I have known personally and intimately, for about a quarter of a century, the worthy gentleman who has been nominated for my place [A voice, "He will never get it" and cheers], and I will say that I regard him as a kind, amiable, an intelligent gentleman, a good citizen and an

honorable opponent; and whatever issue I may have with him will be of principle and not involving personalities. [Cheers.]'

Lincoln's 'well prepared and carefully written' speech before the Springfield Convention stated two distinct propositions, upon which 'I shall take a direct and bold issue with him [great applause].' Consider the first, 'scripture quotations and all [Laughter],' the denial that the Nation could endure half slave and half free. That meant uniformity in local laws and domestic institutions of all the States, said Douglas. Thus Lincoln invited ceaseless conflict until slavery should be established or abolished everywhere — 'a war of sections, a war of the North against the South, of the free States against the slave States — a war of extermination to be continued relentlessly, until the one or the other shall be subdued and all the States shall either become free or become slave.' For that was what it would come to in the end.

Such uniformity was neither possible nor desirable. The founders of the Nation knew that what would suit one section would not do for another; and so they provided that each State should be sovereign over its domestic affairs, and the general Government should exercise only 'specified powers which were general and national. [Cheers.]'

That was the 'fundamental principle' of our complex State and Federal system, asserted Douglas, and 'my friend, Mr. Lincoln, has totally misapprehended' it. In politics, in religion, in industry, in all the activities and conduct of life, 'uniformity is the parent of despotism the world over;' apply it and 'you have destroyed the greatest safeguard which our institutions have thrown around the rights of the citizen. ["Bravo," and great applause.]'

How could such uniformity be had? Only by 'merging the rights and sovereignty of the States in one consolidated empire, and vesting congress with the plenary power to make all the police regulations, domestic and local laws, uniform throughout the limits of the republic.'

When that shall have been done, prophesied Douglas, 'then the states will all be slave or all be free; then negroes will vote everywhere or nowhere; then you will have a Maine liquor law

[prohibition] in every state or none; then you will have uniformity in all things local and domestic by the authority of the federal government. But, when you attain that uniformity you will have converted these thirty-two sovereign, independent states into one consolidated empire, with the uniformity of despotism reigning triumphant throughout the length and breadth of the land. ["hear," "hear," "bravo," and great applause.]'

Variety in local regulations and domestic institutions was vital to liberty, insisted Douglas. If freedom was to be preserved, the sovereignty of the States must be maintained.

Douglas said that he took 'direct issue' with Lincoln's attack upon the Supreme Court. Under the American system it was the duty of the Courts to expound the Constitution and construe the laws; and when the decision of a case was made, all must yield to it. '[Cheers.]' Upon that principle 'our rights, and our liberty, and our property all depend. . . . I have no idea of appealing from the decision of the supreme court upon a constitutional question to the decision of a tumultuous town meeting. [Cheers.]'

A Chicago lawyer once advocated appeals from the State Supreme Court to two Justices of the Peace. '[Great Laughter and applause.] My friend, Mr. Lincoln, who sits behind me reminds me that that proposition was made when I was a Judge of the Supreme Court. Be that as it may, I do not think that fact adds any greater weight or authority to the suggestion. [Renewed laughter and applause.] It matters not with me who was on the bench, whether Mr. Lincoln or myself, whether a Lockwood or a Smith,[1] a Taney or a Marshall; the decision of the highest tribunal known to the Constitution of the Country must be final until it is reversed by an equally high authority. [Cries of "bravo" and applause.]

'Hence I am opposed to this doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, by which he proposes to take an appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon these high constitutional questions, to a republican caucus sitting in the country [A voice — "call it Freesoil," and cheers.] Yes, or to any other caucus or

[1] See Vol. I, 177, 295.

town meeting, whether it be Republican, American, or Democratic. [Cheers.]'

Maintain the Constitution, obey the laws, uphold the Courts, thundered Douglas, and the crowd responded with booming cheers. Lincoln's reason, he continued, for opposing the Dred Scott decision was as bad as his hostility to the Supreme Court itself — the reason that, in holding that a negro, descended from slaves, could not be a citizen, the Court violated the constitutional guarantee that citizens of one State should have all the privileges of citizens of other States. The Supreme Court ruled that that guarantee was for the white man only, and Lincoln asserted that it covered negroes, too.

With the skill of the seasoned debater and campaigner, Douglas made this statement of Lincoln's position the reason for that appeal which was to be the most attractive to voters throughout the lurid months of fighting ahead of him. It was an appeal, too, that gave Lincoln more trouble than anything else that Douglas said, and that forced Lincoln to say some remarkable things. The Little Giant had made the same argument many times before, but during the whole campaign he mercilessly pressed the point anew. It was Douglas's favorite plea for white supremacy, and many Republicans were affected by it.

Even Charles L. Wilson, editor of the *Chicago Journal*, the man who, at Springfield, had placed Lincoln in nomination, was as much against 'negro equality' as he was against slavery. He had written to Trumbull a month before the State Convention was held:[1] 'If there is one rock more dangerous than another in the pathway of the Republican party it is this.' Douglas now rolled this 'dangerous rock' right in front of the Republicans' marching feet:

'This government . . . is founded on the white basis. [Great applause.] It was made by the white man, for the white man, to be administered by white men. [Cheers.]' To be sure, members of any 'inferior race' ought to have all the rights they could use 'consistent with the safety of society' and 'each state must decide for itself the nature and extent of these rights. ["Hear," "hear" and applause.]'

[1] Wilson to Trumbull, Chicago, May 12, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

Illinois had rightly decided that negroes should neither be slaves nor voters; Maine said negroes could vote; neither State had a right to complain of the policy of the other. '["That's so," and cheers.]' New York put a property qualification on negro suffrage. '[Laughter.]' While Douglas did not approve of that, he said, it was not for him or any outsider to tell New York what she should do.

In like manner, other States thought slavery best for them — 'Virginia has the same power by virtue of her sovereignty to protect slavery within her limits as Illinois has to banish it forever from her own borders. ["Hear," "hear," and applause.]' In this as in all domestic regulations, Lincoln's rule of uniformity was neither possible nor right — nor yet wise.

'I do not acknowledge that the states must all be free or must all be slave. I do not acknowledge that the negro must have civil and political rights everywhere or nowhere,' that California should give Chinese the same privileges that Illinois might grant them, that the imported coolies 'must necessarily be put upon an equality with the white race. [Cheers.]'

So, said Douglas, 'the issues between Mr. Lincoln and myself, as respective candidates for the U.S. senate, as made up, are direct, unequivocal, and irreconcilable. He goes for uniformity in our domestic institutions, for a war of sections, until one or the other shall be subdued. I go for the great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, the right of the people to decide for themselves.'

Here a frenzy of cheering stopped Douglas; 'cheer after cheer rent the air;' as the demonstration went on, fireworks were set off, a band played 'Yankee Doodle,' for a long time Douglas could not go on. 'The scene at this period was glorious beyond description,' reported the leading Douglas newspaper. With most of that great throng, at least, the racial appeal had won.

With all his might, Douglas pressed his advantage: 'I am opposed to negro equality' — again the approving uproar broke out. Preserve the purity of our Government as well as the purity of our race; no amalgamation political or otherwise with inferior races! '[Renewed applause.]' See what such mixture had done

in Mexico, Central America, South America, everywhere that it has taken place. '["True," "true."]' Give 'dependent races' every privilege the safety of society would permit — but social, political or any other equality? Never! Once more, wave upon stormy wave of cheering swept up from the great crowd.

Logically, it was the end of Douglas's speech; but conditions were now ideal for an attack upon the political combination against him. He made it. 'The Republican leaders have formed an alliance, an unholy, unnatural alliance, with a portion of the unscrupulous federal office holders. I intend to fight that allied army wherever I meet them. [Cheers.] I know that they deny the alliance while avowing the common purpose, but yet these men who are trying to divide the Democratic party for the purpose of electing a Republican senator in my place, are just as much the agents, the tools, the supporters of Mr. Lincoln as if they were avowed Republicans, and expect their reward for their services when the Republicans come into power. [Cries of "That is true," and cheers.]

'I shall deal with these allied forces just as the Russians dealt with the allies at Sebastopol. The Russians when they fired a broadside at the common enemy did not stop to inquire whether it hit a Frenchman, an Englishman, or a Turk, nor will I stop [laughter and great applause], nor shall I stop to inquire whether my blows hit the Republican leaders or their allies, who are . . . acting in concert with the Republicans to defeat the Democratic party and its nominees. [Cheers and cries of "bravo."]'[1]

Tired out, Douglas said he must stop — 'No! No! Go on!' came the cries. No, he had not been in bed for two nights and had a right to a little sleep — again the cheers arose. He had spoken without preparation and in a desultory manner, he said, and he may have forgotten some points he wished to make. The reception had repaid him for all he had done in the public interest — still more cheers. Finally Douglas ceased; the crowd would not leave but stood there shouting. At the corner of Lake and Dearborn streets a big piece of fireworks was set off, revealing flaming letters until P-O-P-U-L-A-R S-O-V-E-R-E-I-G-N-T-Y

[1] The text differs somewhat from that given by Lincoln on the following day. *Works*, III, 20.

was spelled out. For an hour thousands lingered acclaiming their chieftain and his motto.[1]

When Douglas left the balcony loud calls for Lincoln came. 'Lincoln!' 'Lincoln!' 'Lincoln!' cried his followers lustily. He refused to speak — it was too late, he said, but he would talk to them the next night.

The Douglas press was frantic with joy, that of the Republicans jeered. 'The enthusiasm was really all manufactured for the occasion' and there was little even of that — at least so the editor of the *Chicago Press and Tribune* reported to Trumbull, adding that all Republicans 'were disgusted.'[2] Next morning that paper announced that Lincoln would make answer to Douglas that night at the same place. Handbills to like effect were scattered over the city. Lincoln had sat just within the window behind Douglas, and taken notes of all he said, albeit Douglas's speech was mostly a restatement of former speeches, some of which Lincoln had heard and all of which he had read. Moreover, Douglas's speech was printed in the papers the morning after it was made.

In order to be present at Douglas's meeting, Lincoln had come to Chicago from Springfield the night before, for Herndon wrote: 'Douglas is to be in Chicago on the 9th inst., and Lincoln told me he should be on hand and hear what the giant had to say. This is, I think, prudent.'[3]

The Lincoln meeting was as big as that of Douglas, Lincoln wrote to Koerner five days later, 'and five times as enthusiastic.'[4] Moreover, he continued, it was 'got up without trumpery.'

[1] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 13, 1858, clipped from *Chicago Times*. Douglas's Chicago speech was published in full in the New York *Times*, July 13, *New York Herald*, July 14, 1858, and in other Eastern Democratic and Conservative papers, usually with favorable editorial comment, but sometimes with expression of regret that he had broken with his party.

[2] C. H. Ray to Trumbull, Chicago, *Press and Tribune* office, July 17, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] Herndon, Springfield, to Trumbull, July 8, 1858. Trumbull MSS. The *Chicago Daily Democrat*, July 9, 1858, said that Lincoln was in Chicago trying a case in Court, and the Republican papers said at the time that his presence in Chicago was purely 'accidental.'

[4] The *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 12, 1858, said that Lincoln's meeting was 'about three-fourths as large as that of the previous evening . . . ; and in point of enthusiasm, about four times as great. . . . We presume that 12,000 is a liberal reckoning for the Douglas meeting and 9000 for that of Lincoln.'

Douglas's speech was bombast, his 'rampant endorsement of the Dred Scott decision' actually lost him votes. His tactics were to make it appear that he was having 'a triumphal entry into, and march through the country.' Friends thought that 'we could have voted him down in that very crowd,' and this opinion was confirmed in Lincoln's mind by 'the strong call for me to speak, when he closed.' So let Koerner not be alarmed. 'I write this for your private eye, to assure you that there is no solid shot in these bombastic parades of his.' [1]

In this humor Lincoln spoke from the balcony of the Tremont House on the night of July 10, 1858. 'Senator Douglas was not present,' testified Lincoln.[2] Just as all Douglas men had turned out for their hero the night before, so now Lincoln men made up most of the crowd. He was introduced by the editor of the *Chicago Journal*. 'A perfect storm of cheers' [3] broke out when Lincoln's tall form was seen, and they were continued until he asked for quiet.[4] Lincoln began by thanking Douglas and his friends for having given him a good seat the night before and for 'otherwise very courteous' treatment by them.

The first thing Lincoln made note of, was Douglas's charge of the bi-partisan alliance against him and his defiance that, like the Russians at Sebastopol, he would fire without caring which of the allies he hit. 'Get out your specks,' cried a voice from the crowd while Lincoln was looking over the paper containing Douglas's speech. Finally he found the passage he wanted, and read what Douglas had said, and continued:

'Well, now, gentlemen, is not that very alarming? [Laughter.] Just to think of it! right at the outset of his canvass, I, a poor, kind, amiable, intelligent [Laughter] gentleman [Laughter and renewed cheers] — I am to be slain in this way. Why, my friend the judge is not only, as it turns out, not a dead lion, nor even a living one — he is the rugged Russian bear. [Roars of laughter and applause.]' Well, if we are the allies and he the Russian, 'we barely suggest to him that these allies took Sebastopol.

[1] Lincoln to Koerner, July 15, 1858. Tracy, 89–90.

[2] Note in Lincoln's handwriting opposite report of Lincoln's speech corrected by him. Barrett Collection.

[3] *Chicago Daily Journal* and *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 12, 1858.

[4] *Ib.* and *Chicago Daily Democrat*, July 12, 1858.

[Long and tremendous applause.]' There was no alliance between the Buchanan men and the Republicans so far as contribution of money or sacrifice of principle was concerned. 'I protest that I neither know anything of it nor do I believe it,' asserted Lincoln. But if for Republicans to be rather glad to see the Democratic Party split was an alliance, 'I confess I am in.' A Buchanan man had told him, testified Lincoln, that he wanted to beat Douglas because he had deserted the President at 'the very hardest point to turn,' in the very trouble Douglas himself had stirred up by his Kansas-Nebraska bill. '[Applause.]'

'Popular Sovereignty! everlasting popular sovereignty! [Laughter and continued cheers.] . . . What is it? Why, it is the sovereignty of the people!' But the Dred Scott decision said that if one man took slaves to a Territory, the people could not keep them out. When they made a State Constitution they could exclude slavery, but during all the preceding years of Territorial Government slaves could be taken in, so that they would be there when the Territory became a State. Thus the people would have to tolerate slavery — 'for they will not take the negro slaves and absolutely deprive the owners of them.' In making this point, Lincoln used a great many words, and some of his sentences were somewhat involved and very long.[1]

What was there new in the statement that the people could form a State Constitution? That always had been so, said Lincoln. Why should Douglas pledge himself to fight all his life for that which nobody — certainly no Republican — opposed but which 'Judge Douglas thinks he has invented? [Applause.] I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves [cheers and laughter]; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward.'[2] Lincoln repeated the

[1] *Works*, III, 23–6. All citations of pages are from Lincoln's *Works*, and expressions of applause are from the report of the speech in the *Chicago Daily Democrat*, July 13, 1858, which report Lincoln very carefully corrected with a pen for an edition of the debates between him and Douglas printed two years later, leaving in all brackets about laughter, applause, cheers, etc. The original scrapbook containing the newspaper reports of the speeches of both men, with Lincoln's changes in ink on the margin, is in the Barrett Collection.

[2] *Ib.*, 26–7.

equality clause of the Declaration of Independence: 'There is the origin of popular sovereignty. [Loud applause.] Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it? [Laughter and applause.]'

Lincoln flatly denied that Douglas deserved the credit for beating the Lecompton Constitution. To be sure he had done right in fighting it, but 'all the Republicans in the nation opposed it, and they would have opposed it just as much without Judge Douglas's aid as with it.' Lincoln had been against it before Douglas took his stand, and for the same reason that Douglas belatedly gave. 'I pointed out in a speech a year ago,[1] which I hold in my hand now, that no fair chance was to be given to the people. ["Read it;" "read it."]' Lincoln refused. 'Gentlemen, reading from speeches is a very tedious business, particularly for an old man who has to put on spectacles, and more so if the man be so tall that he has to bend over to the light. [Laughter.]'

Lincoln agreed with Douglas, he said, that the defeat of the Lecompton Constitution was a good thing. 'Who defeated it? [A voice: "Judge Douglas."]' Yes, Lincoln retorted, if Douglas controlled the two anti-Lecompton Democrats in the Senate, he furnished three votes, while the Republicans furnished twenty, and in the House twenty votes to the Republicans, ninety odd. Now, who was it that did the work? [A voice: "Douglas."] Why, yes, Douglas did it? To be sure he did' — and Lincoln went on trying to show that Douglas should not be supported for having beaten Buchanan's Kansas plan, the crowd interrupting with such cries as 'Who killed the bill?' and 'Douglas!' until Lincoln almost lost his temper.[2]

To cries of 'Good,' 'good,' Lincoln repeated the house-divided part of his Springfield speech. Douglas had drawn wrong inferences from that language, said Lincoln; he had merely stated what would happen, not what he thought ought to take place. He did not even say that he wished slavery to be put in course of ultimate extinction. 'I do say so now, however. [Applause.]' It was true, as Douglas said, that that speech had been carefully prepared.

[1] The Springfield speech, June 18, 1857. [2] *Works*, III, 27–30.

'I am not [a] master of language; I have not a fine education; I am not capable of entering into a disquisition upon dialectics, as I believe you call it,' said Lincoln with that self-depreciation which he made use of so often, especially when attacking Douglas, and which was so notable a part of his method throughout this particular campaign.

But, continued Lincoln, what he had said did not bear 'any such construction as Judge Douglas puts upon it' — at least he knew what he *meant*, said Lincoln. Of course the Government had 'endured eighty-two years half slave and half free;' but it had lasted so long only because the public believed all that time that slavery would finally die out. '[Good, good and applause.]' Lincoln asserted that he had always hated slavery, but he had kept quiet about it 'until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska bill began. I always *believed* that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction.' [1]

The framers of the Constitution thought so too — else why did 'those old men' [2] exclude slavery from 'new Territory, where it had not already gone?' or put a period on the African slave trade? Those who now resist the spread of slavery are doing only what the founders of this Government had done. [Cheers.] People of the free States had no right to meddle with slavery in the slave States and ought not to want to do it — he had said that a hundred times. Douglas's charge that he wanted to interfere with that institution where it existed was unwarranted. If he ever had said anything from which such an inference could be drawn, 'I now correct it.' [3]

Here the shouts of the Seventh Ward Delegation announced that they were coming in procession. They were received with enthusiastic cheers. They were Germans, and Lincoln soon made an appeal, directed to them especially, that went to their hearts.

He did not favor 'general consolidation of all the local institutions of the various States,' Lincoln insisted. How on earth

[1] *Works*, III, 30–3.

[2] This was, of course, a mere figure of speech — the framers of the Ordinance of 1787 and of the Constitution were, mostly, young men.

[3] *Works*, III, 33–4.

could such an inference be drawn from anything he had said? He was for the principle of local self-government, but Douglas misapplied it. Each State could do as it liked with all local matters 'that interfere with the right of no other State,' and the General Government could do nothing that did not 'concern the whole.' So how could Douglas infer that, because Lincoln wished to put slavery where the public would feel that it would finally come to an end, he therefore wanted Illinois to interfere with the cranberry laws of Indiana?

Perhaps Douglas drew that inference because he looks upon slavery, 'this matter of keeping one sixth of the population of the whole nation in a state of oppression and tyranny unequaled in the world . . . as . . . only equal to the question of the cranberry laws of Indiana — as something having no moral question in it,' like pasturing land with cattle or planting it with tobacco. But 'a vast portion of the American people' did not look upon slavery as so small a thing, but considered it 'a vast moral evil,' just as the Fathers believed it to be, and 'not as an evil merely confining itself to the States where it is situated.' Still, under the Constitution, in the States where it exists, 'we have no right to interfere with it.[1] [Great applause.]' He was not for 'uniformity of domestic regulations in all the States,' Lincoln reiterated, 'by which I suppose it is meant, if we raise corn here, we must make sugarcane grow here too.' What nonsense!

Lincoln was opposed to the Dred Scott decision, he said, but 'I do not resist it. . . . All that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule.' For example, if he were in Congress, he would vote to prohibit slavery in a new Territory in spite of the Dred Scott decision. '[Applause. "Good for you;" "we hope to see it;" "that's right."]' He submitted to it so far as concerned Dred Scott, said Lincoln, but 'we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably. [Loud applause — cries of "good."]' If another like case came before the Supreme Court, the Dred Scott decision would control it, 'unless the court decides in another way. . . . Well, we mean to do what we can to have the court decide the other way.'

Judicial decisions had no such sacredness as Douglas threw

[1] *Works*, III, 33–7.

around them. Lincoln said he had never heard of such a thing. That very court had rendered decisions just the opposite of that in the Dred Scott case. 'It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history [Laughter] . . . based upon falsehood . . . as to the facts . . . a new wonder of the *world* [Laughter and applause] — and no decision made on any question.' No such decision had ever been held 'by the profession as law.' It always required 'confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as settled law.'

Douglas himself once approved the course of General Jackson when he declared that the Supreme Court could not 'lay down a rule to govern a co-ordinate branch of the government, . . . each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it.' Douglas some years ago had said that Jackson was right. So 'what has now become of all his tirade against "resistance to the Supreme Court?" ["Gone up," "Gone to the theatre."]' [1]

Why did Douglas confine to the Republican leaders his warfare on the alleged alliance against him? Because 'he wants it understood that the mass of the Republican party are really his friends.' But where would that party be if Republicans helped reëlect Douglas? In this 'mighty issue . . . upon which hang the destinies of the nation,' said Lincoln, 'it is nothing to you — nothing to the mass of the people . . . whether or not Judge Douglas or myself shall ever be heard of after this night.' If the Lecompton question should come up again, Douglas 'stands where he stood when in spite of him and his opposition you built up the Republican party. If you indorse him, you tell him you do not care whether slavery be voted up or down, and he will close, or try to close, your mouths with his declaration repeated by the day, the week, the month, and the year. . . . [A voice "Hit him again."]

'I could ask the Republican party, after all the hard names Judge Douglas has called them by, all his repeated charges of their inclination to marry with and hug negroes, all his declarations of Black Republicanism — by the way, we are improving, the black has got rubbed off — but with all that, if he be in-

[1] *Works*, III, 37–41.

dorsed by Republican votes, where do you stand? Plainly, you stand ready saddled, bridled, and harnessed, and waiting to be driven over to the slavery extension camp of the nation, [A voice, "We will hang ourselves first"] . . . every man with a rope around his neck, that halter being held by Judge Douglas.'

Even if the Republican Party should thus foolishly dissolve, a new one would form in time to keep new regions for 'free white laborers, who want the land to bring up their families upon. It is better then, to save the work while it is begun. You have done the labor; maintain it, keep it.' If Republicans should go off after Douglas now, 'as surely as God reigns over you, . . . you will at last come back after your wanderings, merely to do your work over again. [Loud applause.]' [1]

No one wants to deny that the Government was made for white men, in the form Douglas put it, said Lincoln; but again Douglas indulged 'his passion for drawing inferences that are not warranted.' Here Lincoln repeated, word for word, his Springfield speech of the year before about not wanting a negro woman for either slave or wife, '[Laughter and cheers],' there being enough whites and blacks of both sexes to marry their own kind, and that the races would not mix in the Territories if the inferior one was not allowed to go there. '[Immense applause, a voice, "Three cheers for Lincoln!" The cheers were given with a hearty good will.]' [2]

Then Lincoln made his appeal to the Germans. The Fourth of July was celebrated in memory of those 'iron men' who won our independence and founded our Government. From such men we were descended, and had made progress unparalleled in the history of the world. But perhaps half our people had a different ancestry — they were immigrants from Europe who, nevertheless, here found 'themselves our equal in all things.' For they were spiritual kinsmen of the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence which said that 'all men are created equal.'

That 'moral sentiment taught in that day' made these immigrants feel that they 'were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh, of the men who wrote that Declaration [Loud and long continued applause], and so they are. That is the electric cord

[1] *Works*, III, 41–5. [2] *Ib.*, 45–6. This is in the *Works*.

in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world. [Applause.]'[1]

How did the Declaration square with Douglas's idea of 'don't care if slavery is voted up or down,' or with the Dred Scott decision? '[A voice, Hit him again.]' Douglas said that the Declaration meant only that Americans asserted their equality with the English people. 'According to his construction, you Germans are not connected with it.' Douglas's teachings tended to destroy love of liberty and change the form of our Government. His reasoning, that inferior races should have only such rights as they were capable of enjoying, was 'the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world . . . the same old serpent that says, You work and I eat.'

If Douglas's 'don't care' proposition were accepted, 'it does not stop with the negro.' Where would the process of making exceptions to the Declaration end? 'If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute-book in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out. [cries of "No, no."] Let us stick to it, then; [Cheers.] let us stand firmly by it, then. [Applause.]'

When the Government was founded certain conditions existed that had to be submitted to. 'We had slaves among us; we could not get our Constitution unless we permitted them to remain in slavery;' that unavoidable submission 'does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties. Let that charter stand as our standard.'

When the Saviour said, '"Be ye [therefore] perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,"' he did not expect any one to reach such excellence; but 'he set that up as a standard, and he who did most toward reaching that standard attained the highest degree of moral perfection.' So let the principle that all men are created equal, 'be as nearly reached as we can. If we cannot give freedom to every creature, let us do

[1] *Works*, III, 46–8.

nothing that will impose slavery upon any other creature. [Applause.] Let us then turn this government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it.' Otherwise 'we are tending in the contrary direction that our friend Judge Douglas proposes — not intentionally — working in the traces that tend to make this one universal slave nation. [A voice, "That is so."] He is one that runs in that direction, and as such I resist him.'

Thus Lincoln reached the climax of his peroration. 'Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man, this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal.' [1]

Ringing cheers came like blasts of a thousand bugles.[2] Lincoln had struck the chord that appealed most to the fighting Republicans of Northern Illinois. His letter of elation to Koerner was wholly justified. Not since the emotional scenes at Bloomington when he made his 'Lost Speech' two years before, had such a demonstration been witnessed by him. The sheer oratory of the closing passages of his Chicago speech had worked its spell.

The leading Republican papers of Illinois published Lincoln's speech in full and praised it highly; the Douglas press made scornful reference to it; the few Buchanan organs were not abusive, to say the least. Stating that Lincoln's presence in Chicago at the time was purely 'accidental' [3] the *Chicago Press and Tribune* declared that, in spite of hurried preparation, his speech was an 'overwhelming refutation' of that of Douglas, and that while the Douglas audience had been indifferent, Lincoln's 'was enthusiastically for Lincoln' — in short, Lincoln had 'knocked Douglas higher than a kite.' [4]

In the East, journals friendly to Douglas were fair to Lincoln and printed his speech as conspicuously as they had published

[1] *Works*, III, 19–52.

[2] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 13, 1858, and other Republican papers.

[3] Herndon to Trumbull, July 8, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[4] July 12, 13, 1858. Editorial and news item.

that of his rival, and with the *Chicago Republican* version of the meeting and incidents of it.[1] But the slight comment of the Eastern Republican press on Lincoln's Chicago speech was only mildly favorable. Still even conservative papers in New York thought that he would win. 'If the rank and file of both democrats and republicans oppose Judge Douglas, who will be left to support him?' [2]

At best, Douglas had a task that would tax his utmost powers; Lincoln was an able man and the Republicans were burning to beat Douglas, their old-time foe; Lincoln had taken 'the strictest party grounds,' much to the disappointment of 'his political friends in the East,' but Douglas had scorned to conciliate Republicans and 'with all his accustomed gallantry . . . [was] waging unsparing war' on them and Administration Democrats alike — such was the New York *Times*' analysis of the Illinois fight.[3] The Southern press that favored Douglas was far more enthusiastic over his speech than was any Republican paper outside of Illinois over Lincoln's speech, and even the 'ultraists' of the South began to talk of supporting Douglas for President in 1860.[4]

For a week the two combatants stayed in Chicago, Douglas making arrangements for his trip to Springfield, where the Democratic State Committee was to prepare with him his schedule of appointments for the campaign, and Lincoln attending the Federal Court and conferring with the party managers. The Republican State Chairman was in New York at the time. Upon his return he wrote to Trumbull that some Republicans had been 'lost' largely because of Greeley's course, but that there would be a reaction against Douglas before the campaign should end. The fight was on and 'Lincoln has commenced it gallantly. The only trouble will be that (as I told him) he will allow Douglass to put him on the defensive.' Trumbull must hurry back and help with his organizing talent — 'come by the way of New York and straighten out the newspapers there:' if we fail in this contest all hopes for Republicanism in 1860 are gone.[5]

[1] New York *Times*, July 16, 1858.
[2] *New York Herald*, July 12, 1858.
[3] New York *Times*, July 16, 1858.
[4] *Richmond Enquirer*, July 14, 1858.
[5] Judd to Trumbull, Chicago, July 16, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

Attached to the Illinois Central train from Chicago for Bloomington, July 16, 1858, was a private car, decorated with mottoes and flags.[1] In it were Douglas and his wife who had come to Chicago with him and who now accompanied her husband throughout the long hard series of campaign trips of which this was the first. With Douglas, too, were his secretary, two stenographers, and Democratic Party officials. Press correspondents could come in when they wished, Democratic delegations were also welcomed.

Republicans made the most of such luxury. A private car! Awful! The railroads were for Douglas! But, in fact, considering the comfort of Mrs. Douglas, the size of the company, and the sheer necessities of the situation, it was only good sense for Douglas to take a private car while he could get it — for he was starting on a campaign that lasted for more than three months and took him many thousands of miles to every part of the State by every kind of conveyance.[2]

On the same train was Lincoln, for it had been decided that he should follow Douglas wherever he went.

At Joliet, where, reported the Douglas organ at Springfield, 'the earth was fairly shaken by the cheers of the thousands,'[3] a flat car was coupled to the end of the train, and on it was a brass cannon served by two young men in semi-military uniform. When stations where stops were made came into view, the gun was fired repeatedly, and everybody in town was thus informed that Douglas was coming. All through the campaign, he took this piece of artillery with him whenever it was possible to do so, and 'Douglas's powder' became one of the many picturesque features of those hectic months. His well-cut and carefully brushed coat and trousers were of blue broadcloth and upon his massive head he wore a big wide-brimmed white felt hat which, contrasting sharply with his heavy long black hair and dark complexion, added a touch of the theatrical to his appearance.

At Bloomington, Douglas was to make his first speech. Al-

[1] Koerner, II, 61.

[2] The statistics of Douglas's speeches and journeys during this campaign are given in *Era:* Cole, 170, from the New York *Times*, clipped in *Illinois State Register*, Nov. 23, 1858.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 19, 1858.

though it was in Republican territory, more than two thousand people were there to greet and hear him. The roar of the cannon on the flat car was answered by thunders of artillery from the town, and when the great man got off the train, the usual procession, led by a band playing 'Hail Columbia,' escorted him through cheering throngs to the Landon House, which was gaily decorated in his honor. That night Douglas spoke in the Court House square.[1]

In the main his speech was the same as that made in Chicago; but it was even clearer than that lucid performance, and eighty thousand copies of it in pamphlet form were distributed all over Illinois, and many were sent throughout the Union.[2] Again he charged a coalition between the Republican organization and the Administration managers to beat him — charged it in stronger terms than before. Still, said Douglas, if the people believed that Lincoln would serve Illinois better than he they ought to elect him.

Douglas enlarged his reply to Lincoln's house-divided declaration; convince either North or South of the truth of that, make it the policy of either section, and the necessary, the inevitable result would be war. 'What man in Illinois would not lose the last drop of his heart's blood before he would submit to the institution of slavery being forced upon us by the other States, against our will?' The same was true of Southern men, if the North should try to abolish it in their States. Why not let the people of each State do as they pleased about slavery, and be accountable to their God for their action? 'It is not for me to arraign them for what they do. I will not judge them, lest I shall be judged' — a Biblical quotation Lincoln was to make use of less than seven years later in the greatest utterance of his life.[3]

Lincoln had said in his Chicago speech that he did not mean that the free States should '*enter into* the Southern States and interfere with slavery.' 'Oh, no!' exclaimed Douglas; 'they stand on this side of the Ohio River and shoot across.' In practical results abolition pamphlets were as bad as bombs. Sec-

[1] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 19, 1858; Stevens, 550.

[2] Sheahan, 417. [3] The Second Inaugural, March 4, 1865.

tional agitation which had created a sectional party had also created all the trouble.

If he were in the Senate, just how would Lincoln make all States free? asked Douglas. By a bill to abolish slavery in Kentucky? By a proposal to amend the Constitution? 'Who among you expects to live, or have his children live, until slavery shall be established in Illinois or abolished in South Carolina?' It was beside the point to say that slavery must not go into Kansas; the people were to vote on the Lecompton Constitution and would surely defeat it. So that question was out of the way.

And just how would Lincoln reverse the Dred Scott decision? By electing a Republican President and packing the Court with Republican Justices, pledged in advance to decide a particular case in a particular way? Would the people have confidence in such a Court? Moreover, the Justices were on the Bench for life and probably would not die soon enough to let such a President, if such a President ever could be elected, fill their places, as Lincoln planned.

So 'what is he going to do about it?' Put through a bill to restore the Missouri Compromise? That would be doing something that the Supreme Court had just said Congress could not do. Thus Congress would be at war with the highest tribunal in the land. Was that sensible or patriotic? Could anything worse come to pass? Yet that was the certain end of Lincoln's plan.

In such fashion Douglas met the points made by Lincoln in his Chicago speech. He went over again his argument against negro equality and added: Lincoln's objection to the Dred Scott decision is that it denies citizenship to negroes and thus controverts the equality phrase of the Declaration. According to Lincoln that was a standard toward which all should strive just as all should try to reach Jesus' standard of perfection even 'as your Father in heaven is perfect.' As the beginning of that approach, Lincoln wanted negroes to be citizens; but the first step toward that would be the repeal of the Illinois law forbidding free negroes to come into the State. Did Lincoln favor that?

He did not understand Lincoln to assert that negroes should be made our equals socially, nor even 'in fact as citizens,' said Douglas, but only our equals 'under the law;' yet he thus ad-

mits the right of the negro woman to marry the white man. Deny it as he would, explain or qualify, there was where Lincoln's doctrine of racial equality must come at last — the right of negroes to vote, to hold office, to become lawmakers, executives, judges, and in the end the right of amalgamation if they could attain it.

Here Douglas made by far the most important part of his speech — a point which he had overlooked at Chicago, although he had stated it many times before during the last ten years. That point was that slavery could not exist in any place, where the people did not want it. It was the creature of municipal law and required local police regulations for its protection. Even with these protections slavery could not be forced upon an unwilling people, said Douglas; Kansas was proof of that. Under the laws of the so-called 'bogus' Legislature slavery was well guarded, yet it had decreased there all the time.

'Why has not slavery obtained a foothold in Kansas under these circumstances? Simply because there was a majority of her people opposed to slavery, and every slaveholder knew that if he took his slaves there, the moment that majority got possession of the ballot-boxes, and a fair election was held, that moment slavery would be abolished, and he would lose them.'

If slavery had thus died out under protective local laws, how long could it last under unfriendly legislation? 'I tell you, my friends, it is impossible under our institutions to force slavery on an unwilling people.' Let the principle of popular sovereignty be fairly carried out, and 'slavery will never exist one day, or one hour in any Territory, against the unfriendly legislation of an unfriendly people.' That was the practical result, no matter 'how the Dred Scott decision may have settled the abstract question,' asserted Douglas, and he quoted the language of an eminent Southern Senator to the same effect although in terms much stronger.[1]

[1] 'I do not care a fig which the decision shall be, for it is of no particular consequence; slavery cannot exist a day or an hour, in any Territory or State, unless it has affirmative laws sustaining and supporting it, furnishing police regulations and remedies; and an omission to furnish them would be as fatal as a constitutional prohibition. Without affirmative legislation in its favor, slavery could not exist any longer than a newborn infant could survive under the heat of the sun, on a barren rock, without protec-

If the people of a Territory were for slavery they would pass laws and adopt police regulations — patrol laws and the like — as every slave State had done; but 'if they do not want it, they will withhold that legislation, and by withholding it slavery is as dead as if it was prohibited by a constitutional prohibition, especially if, in addition, their legislation is unfriendly, as it would be if they were opposed to it.' Thrice in this speech Douglas asserted the doctrine of unfriendly legislation and thrice declared that the Dred Scott decision was an abstraction without practical effect; a conclusion, which, as we have seen, had been reached and announced by the conservative press of the North, soon after the decision was made.

At the end of his very long speech, Douglas again told the crowd to vote for Lincoln if they thought that he could do more than Douglas to promote sectional harmony, preserve the Union and advance the prosperity, honor, and glory of Illinois, but added that he would be grateful for their support if they believed that he had been faithful to his trust.[1]

Lincoln had been given a place on the platform and listened to Douglas's speech, and, late as it was, the crowd called loudly for him. 'He held back for a little while,' but when he did come forward his friends gave him 'three rousing cheers much louder than those given to Judge Douglas.' He rose, he said, to tell the crowd that he would soon visit them again and make a speech, but that 'this meeting was called by the friends of Judge Douglas and it would be improper for me to address it.' [2]

We are fortunate in having the description of Lincoln at this time, by an eyewitness of unusual trustworthiness and with special training in the observation of appearance, manners, dress, and the like. Leonard W. Volk, who two years later made the famous life mask of Lincoln, was in Douglas's party,[3] and was introduced to Lincoln while on the way to Springfield. Volk had

tion. It would wilt and die for the want of support.' This extract is given in Lincoln's *Works*, III, 89, without the name of the Senator making the statement.

[1] *Works*, III, 54–107. Attacks by the Douglas press upon Lincoln's criticism of the Supreme Court for the Dred Scott decision called out defensive replies from the Republican papers. Lincoln and all Republicans intended to get it reversed because 'the Dred Scott iniquity' made slavery National, 'but no one proposes to rebel.' *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 16, 1858.

[2] *Bloomington Pantagraph*, July 17, 1858. [3] Whitney, 540.

been a young workman in a marble yard at Quincy.[1] Douglas had discovered him there, seen his talent, and sent him to Italy whence he had lately returned. His first work had been to make a bust of his benefactor, and on the present journey, he got Lincoln's order for the life mask.[2]

Lincoln came into the hotel at Bloomington alone, relates Volk, 'carrying an old carpet-bag in his hand, and wearing a weather-beaten silk hat — too large, apparently, for his head — a long, loosely fitting frock-coat, of black alpaca, and vest and trousers of the same material.' He was certainly very dusty, and while he was washing, several old friends 'rushed in to see him, some of them shouting, "How are you, Old Abe?". . . This was the first good view I had of the "coming man," though I had seen him at a distance, and passed him on the sidewalk in Chicago a few days before.' [3]

Next day, on the train to which Douglas's car was attached, Lincoln was again a passenger — 'the only Lincoln man on the train.' [4] It was at Atlanta, on the board-walk in front of the hotel, that Volk was introduced to Lincoln.

'He saluted me with his natural cordiality,' relates Volk, 'grasping my hand in both his large hands with a vise-like grip, and, looking down into my face with his beaming, dark, dull eyes, said:

'"How do you do? I am glad to meet you. I have read of you in the papers: you are making a statue of Judge Douglas for Governor Matteson's new house."

'"Yes, sir," I answered; "and sometime, when you are in Chicago and can spare the time, I would like to have you sit to me for your bust."

'"Yes, I will, Mr. Volk — shall be glad to, the first opportunity I have."' [5]

But that opportunity did not come until after Lincoln's nomination for the Presidency, and then only the cast of the face was made.

As the Douglas train sped toward Springfield, the rain which

[1] Browning's *Diary*, I, 295, July 20, 1857.
[2] Whitney, 548.
[3] Volk's statement in Whitney, 540.
[4] Sheahan, 417.
[5] Volk's statement in Whitney, 540–1.

had been falling heavily for hours suddenly stopped. The downpour, however, had spoiled the elaborate decorations which the Democratic committee had hung in Edwards's Grove north of the city where the meeting was to be held, trees were dripping, the ground soggy and steaming. Yet, testifies Volk, there was 'a vast crowd waiting,' and, he continues: 'On leaving the train, most of the passengers climbed over the fences and crossed the stubble-field, taking a short-cut to the grove, among them Mr. Lincoln, who stalked forward alone, taking immense strides, the before-mentioned carpet-bag and an umbrella in his hands, and his coat-skirts flying in the breeze. I managed to keep pretty close in the rear of the tall, gaunt figure, with the head craned forward, apparently much over the balance, like the Leaning Tower of Pisa, that was moving something like a hurricane across the rough stubble-field! He approached the rail-fence, sprang over it as nimbly as a boy of eighteen, and disappeared from my sight.' [1]

The greeting of Douglas was frantic. 'It is impossible to describe it,' wrote the editor of the *Chicago Times* who was there.[2] Another bad sign for the Republicans was that an old line Whig, and the author of the prohibition bill of 1855 at that, Benjamin S. Edwards, presided and introduced Douglas.[3] His Springfield speech was identical in argument with those made in Chicago and Bloomington; but much of the language was different and the clarity of statement had increased, as always is the case with a campaigner who makes, extemporaneously, the same speech.

Also Douglas was in unusually good spirits and his delivery was such that friends declared the Springfield speech the best he had made in the campaign.[4] Again a pamphlet edition — this time of fifty thousand — was scattered over the State.[5] The newspaper report of it is full of cries from hearers, applause,

[1] Volk's statement in Whitney, 541. At the Douglas meeting Volk mistook a man on horseback for Lincoln. Lincoln did not stay to hear Douglas.

[2] Sheahan, 417. Also Springfield Correspondence, New York *Times*, July 19, 1858, reproduced conspicuously in *Richmond Enquirer*, July 29, 1858, and in many other papers. This dispatch was uncommonly fair and spoke highly of Lincoln.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 19, 1858.

[4] Koerner, II, 64. [5] Sheahan, 418.

and cheers. The *Richmond Enquirer*,[1] which from the first had taken Douglas's side against the President, printed the speech in full. The *New Orleans Delta* came out for him.[2] Even the bitterly hostile and extreme 'Southern rights,' fire-eating *South Side Democrat*, published at the capital of Virginia, was won over, in spite of Douglas's repeated assertion that slavery could not exist in the Territories without friendly local legislation.[3]

Frequently Douglas made the crowd laugh. Some Democrats blamed him for his votes 'because the republicans voted the same way. [Great laughter. "What did they say."] Why, many of them said that Douglas voted with the republicans, yes . . . with black republicans. [Renewed laughter.]' But it was just the other way round, for, as the New York *Tribune* had declared, 'the Republicans went over to Douglas and voted with him. ["Good," and cheers.]'

With contempt Douglas dismissed Lincoln's charge of a conspiracy on the part of two Presidents, the Supreme Court, and himself involving the Kansas-Nebraska act and the Dred Scott decision. 'If Mr. Lincoln deems *me* a conspirator of that kind, all I have to say is that *I* do not think so badly of the President of the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States. [Three cheers were here given for the Supreme Court of the United States.]'

Again Douglas announced, and at great length, his familiar doctrine that slavery could not exist anywhere unless protected by friendly local legislation, and not even then if the temper of the people was hostile to it.[4] At even greater length, and with stronger blows, Douglas drove home his issue of negro equality to shouts of 'bravo,' 'good,' and 'hurrah for Douglas.' All white

[1] July 26, 1858. On July 8, this leading Southern paper printed a strong editorial in support of Douglas.

[2] July 20, 1858, in *Richmond Enquirer*, July 29, 1858.

[3] Clipped in *ib.* Although still lashing Douglas for his war on the President which 'puts him out of the pale of future hopes from the Democracy,' the *South Side Democrat* was for him in his fight for the Senate. Oh, why had such a man wrecked his national career! 'We cannot read his speeches at Chicago or Springfield without regretting that a man, so sound on the great Constitutional questions which divide Black Republicanism and Democracy, should have permitted himself to risk his future, his party, and the hopes of the country, on an issue such as that which led him off from his old associates.'

[4] Douglas made use of over six hundred words in his careful explanation of this point. *Works* (Lincoln's), III, 138–41.

people, emigrants or natives, Germans, Irish, French, Scotch, English, were 'our equals,' but negroes were not, Douglas asserted. 'Glory to you,' 'Hurrah for Douglas,' and tumultuous cheers came from the crowd. Once more Douglas paid tribute to Lincoln and in terms of much higher praise than before — there was no objection to him except for his 'monstrous revolutionary doctrines' which he meant to carry out if he won. '["He never shall."]'

Lincoln was not present,[1] for he was hard at work preparing for the Republican counter demonstration in the evening. But no matter, for the junior partner 'was on the ground,' as he wrote to Trumbull,[2] and he said that Douglas only made enemies. When Douglas finished there was the customary cheering, reports of which, on both sides, we shall soon get very tired of hearing, and the rejoicing Democrats formed a procession and marched into town.[3] But the whole thing was a 'grand failure,' said the leading Republican paper of the State.[4]

That night,[5] in the Hall of the House of Representatives, Lincoln again made answer to Douglas, who was not there, having gone on to fill another speaking engagement.[6] Lincoln took the stand 'amid the cheers of his auditors.'[7] Except to complain of Republican 'disadvantages' in the campaign, Lincoln stated no new point. One of these disadvantages was the legislative apportionment law, as to which, however, 'perhaps there is no ground of complaint on our part.' The other was the contrast between Douglas and himself.

'Senator Douglas is of world-wide renown. All the anxious politicians of his party, or who have been of his party for years past, have been looking upon him as certainly, at no distant day, to be the President of the United States. They have seen in his round, jolly, fruitful face, post-offices, land-offices, and

[1] 'I did not hear him.' Lincoln's statement in his night speech. *Ib.*, 169.

[2] Herndon to Trumbull, July 22, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 19, 1858.

[4] Springfield Correspondence, *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 19, in issue July 20, 1858.

[5] July 17, 1858. [6] Stevens, 551.

[7] Springfield Correspondence, *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 19, in issue July 20, 1858.

marshalships and cabinet appointments, chargé-ships and foreign missions, bursting and sprouting out in wonderful exuberance, ready to be laid hold of by their greedy hands. [Great laughter.] And as they have been gazing upon this attractive picture so long, they cannot, in the little distraction that has taken place in the party, bring themselves to give up the charming hope; but with greedier anxiety they rush about him, sustain him, and give him marches, triumphal entries, and receptions beyond what even in the days of his highest prosperity they could have brought about in his favor.

'On the contrary, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. [Tremendous cheering and laughter.] These are disadvantages all, taken together, that the Republicans labor under.' [1]

What despicable, what hypocritical self-abasement, said the *Chicago Times*, when commenting on these curious passages; Lincoln talked like Uriah Heep! [2]

Then Lincoln went on to expose Douglas's plan of campaign, including 'their thunderings of cannon, their marching and music, their fizzle-gigs and fireworks,' which were, however, 'auxiliary' to his speeches, 'substantially one and the same' everywhere.[3] Why should Douglas get the credit for defeating the Lecompton Constitution? asked Lincoln; and again he gave the mathematical comparison of Democratic and Republican votes against it, that he had made in Chicago.[4] This brought out 'tremendous cheering,' we are told.

Douglas was like the lost sheep found by the owner and brought home in glee, said Lincoln. '[Great cheering, renewed cheering.] "Verily, I say unto you, there is more rejoicing in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." [Cheering.]' So 'let him repent [Vociferous applause]' and the Republicans would forgive him. '[Laughter and cheers.]'

[1] *Works*, III, 157–8. Again expressions of cheers, laughter, etc., are taken from the newspaper report of Lincoln's speech in the book of press reports revised by Lincoln. Barrett Collection.

[2] *Chicago Times*, July 19, 1858.

[3] *Works*, III, 159–60.

[4] *Works*, III, 165–6.

Who denied that the people of a Territory could form any State Constitution they wished? Was that what Douglas was 'going to spend his life for? Does he expect to stand up in majestic dignity, and go through his *apotheosis* and become a god, in the maintaining of a principle which neither man nor mouse in all God's creation is opposing?' [1]

Lincoln spent much time over Douglas's statement that he had read Lincoln's house-divided speech with care, but complained of Douglas's quotation from it. 'I will not say that he wilfully misquotes, but he does fail to quote accurately.' So Lincoln himself would repeat the passage from memory, and if Douglas 'repeats his misrepresentation, it shall be plain to all that he does so wilfully.' If so Lincoln would have to change his course and take another, 'better suited to the real exigencies of the case.' To this threat, Lincoln added: 'I set out, in this campaign, with the intention of conducting it strictly as a gentleman, in substance at least, if not in the outside polish. The latter I shall never be, but that which constitutes the inside of a gentleman I hope I understand, and am not less inclined to practice than others. [Cheers.]' It would not be his fault, said Lincoln, if his plan to make the fight 'upon principle, and with fairness on both sides,' had to be given up.[2]

What had made Lincoln thus angry, was Douglas's charge that his statement that the Nation must become all free or all slave meant war. It meant no such thing, Lincoln insisted, and it was not fair of Douglas to say that it did. So Lincoln again repeated the now familiar house-divided passage and said that in it he had stated his expectation, not his wish. Could not Douglas see the difference?

'I have often expressed an expectation to die, but I have never expressed a wish to die.' [3] Lincoln restated his Chicago speech to the effect that all he wanted was to stop the spread of slavery as the Missouri Compromise had done, up to the repeal of which the public mind believed that it would finally die out; and he quoted Brooks of South Carolina as saying, 'when they were presenting him with canes, silver plate, gold pitchers and the like, for assaulting Senator Sumner,' that 'when this Consti-

[1] *Works*, III, 164. [2] *Ib.*, 171. [3] *Ib.*, III, 172–3.

tution was formed, it was the belief of no man that slavery would last to the present day.' [1]

Consolidation! When Congress kept slavery out of new Territories and Courts decided that to take a slave into a free country made him free, did consolidation follow? He had said at Chicago, Lincoln reiterated, that he opposed the Dred Scott decision only as stating a 'political rule;' yet Douglas kept up his attack, forgetting that 'I have turned the tables against himself on that very point.' But that was like Douglas. Turn his own point against him 'and gaff him through — he will still cling to it till he can invent some new dodge to take the place of it.' [2]

Lincoln quoted most of Jefferson's celebrated denial that the judiciary is the final expounder of the Constitution — 'a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy' — and the great radical's insistence that each department of government must decide its constitutional powers and duties for itself. That, said Lincoln, showed that Douglas's judicial theory 'would reduce us to the despotism of an oligarchy.' [3] After giving the remainder of his Chicago arguments on the Dred Scott decision, Lincoln exclaimed:

'Free men of Sangamon, free men of Illinois, free men everywhere, judge ye between him and me upon this issue.' [4]

Of course slavery could and would go into the Territories against the will of their people under the Dred Scott decision, insisted Lincoln. Was it not forced upon the colonies over the opposition of the colonists — planted 'by individual men in spite of the wishes of the people; the mother government refusing to prohibit it, and withholding from the people of the colonies the authority to prohibit it for themselves?' That was the exact situation in which the Territories were now placed by the Dred Scott decision.

This was as near as Lincoln came to discussing Douglas's assertion that slavery could not exist against unfriendly local legis-

[1] *Works*, III, 174–5. [2] *Ib.*, 177–8.

[3] *Ib.*, 179. See Jefferson to William Charles Jarvis, Sept. 28, 1820.

[4] *Ib.*, III, 180–1.

lation, until he asked Douglas his famous question on that subject at Freeport nearly six weeks later.

As to negro equality: if the Declaration did not mean what it said, amend it so as to read, 'that all men are created equal, except negroes,' cried Lincoln. Douglas had said at first, that the 'created equal' phrase applied only to the colonists and Englishmen; but when Lincoln had pointed out that, if so, it did not include immigrants, Douglas had amended his definition so as to cover all Europeans. Well, then, did it embrace Russians in Asia? asked Lincoln. Pretty soon Douglas would again amend his statement. 'He is not at all particular. He is satisfied with anything which does not endanger the nationalizing of negro slavery. It may draw white men down, but it must not lift negroes up.' [1]

With reference to the blacks, the Declaration meant only that they were the equals of the whites in their right to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' said Lincoln. 'All I ask for the negro is that if you do not like him, let him alone. If God gave him but little, that little let him enjoy.'

Since Douglas had not denied Lincoln's charge of conspiracy against him and others, to repeal the Missouri Compromise and procure the Dred Scott decision, '*on his own tacit admission I renew that charge. I charge him with having been a party to that conspiracy, . . . for the sole purpose of nationalizing slavery.*' [2]

With these grave words, Lincoln closed, 'amidst loud and continuous cheering.' His friends had been urging him to take the aggressive. He had done so. Answering a letter of a supporter who had complained of his '*defensive*' tactics, Lincoln agreed and said that he hoped that his Springfield speech, although 'not very well reported . . . in the *State Journal*,' would show that he was 'already improving.' [3]

With seeming contempt, the Douglas organ asked comparison of its hero's 'masterly' speech and the 'fretful and feeble declaration' of Lincoln in reply to it. That he knew he was beaten already was shown by the fact that his 'customary good nature'

[1] *Works*, III, 182–6. [2] *Ib.*, 186–8. Italics author's.

[3] Lincoln to John Mathers, July 20, 1858. *Ib.*, 188. Of this speech Lincoln heard that it was the most 'taking' speech he had made. It was printed in pamphlet form and also in a German edition. Lincoln to Koerner, Aug. 6, 1858. Tracy, 92–3.

disappeared and he became 'excited and ill tempered.' Let him call Douglas a 'dead lion' and himself a 'living dog' if he liked, but vulgar impugning of motives of those who supported Douglas as 'conscientiously' as Lincoln opposed him would not make people forget that Lincoln himself was in eager pursuit of Douglas's place. Think of Douglas leaving his sick-bed in Washington and going to the Senate to 'make a last and noble effort in behalf of the principles of freedom;' and then think of Lincoln trailing Douglas about Illinois to get crowds and 'hurl upon Douglas and the supreme court his repeated charges of "Conspiracy."'[1] The *State Register* even printed Lincoln's answer to Douglas two days before the Republican organ published it. Look at the two and judge, said the Democratic paper.[2] Day after day its columns were filled with editorials of mingled argument, derision, and scorn.[3]

Republican papers glorified Lincoln's speech: the cheering was 'tremendous,' and no wonder, for 'his onslaught was terrible' and he 'completely demolished Mr. Douglas.'[4] Although not the equal of Douglas as a leader, Lincoln was 'a remarkably able man. . . . And he will be, beyond all question, the strongest opponent that could be found in the State to oppose Mr. Douglas,' wrote the correspondent of a leading New York journal.[5] But Republican politicians were not so sure. Hurry back and take charge, wrote the State Auditor to Trumbull; Douglas and his friends were 'burning *rosin* at a great rate.' It was to be a hard fight: 'We old line whigs belonging to the Republican ranks are not worth a curse to carry on a campaign;' former Democrats must do it.[6]

The ever cheerful Herndon, however, thought that the speech of his senior partner was 'a "whaler."' Still, 'Lincoln made no special converts,' the junior partner admitted, but then neither did Douglas. However, Herndon was especially joyous, at the moment, for he had just received a letter from Greeley which

[1] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 22, 1858. [2] *Ib.*, July 17, 1858.

[3] *Ib.*, July 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, *et seq.*, 1858.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 19, 1858.

[5] Springfield Correspondence, New York *Times*, July 19, 1858, clipped in *Richmond Enquirer*, July 29, 1858.

[6] Jesse K. Dubois, Springfield, to Trumbull, July 17, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

said: 'Now, Herndon, I am going to do all I reasonably can to elect Lincoln.' [1]

Before Lincoln made his speech, the *State Register* was on the streets with a long and serious editorial about Lincoln, to which he paid no heed then or for nearly two months afterward, although through the press and general talk it was kept before the people all the time. The editorial was a revival of the old charges against Lincoln for his famous 'spot' resolutions and certain votes in Congress during the Mexican War, which, as we have seen, hurt him badly at the time, and, temporarily, stopped his political career.[2]

Soon after his nomination the *Chicago Times* [3] had accused Lincoln of having voted against supplies for the American troops in Mexico; but Republican papers had easily refuted this, since Lincoln did not enter the House until the war was practically over. Besides, the war 'was a trumped up humbug' anyway, 'a war of the politicians in the interest of the South, . . . a pro-slavery raid . . . upon a neighboring pigmy.' [4] So the Democratic press, thereafter carefully keeping within the record, made Lincoln's opposition to the war an issue in the campaign and continued to press it until election day, and it had an appreciable effect upon voters.

Just before Lincoln's Springfield speech of July 17, 1858, the Chicago Republican organ had given the Democratic press an opening to renew the attack. It printed an extract from Lincoln's anti-war speech in the House, together with a provocative editorial.[5] The *State Register* now told how Lincoln had canvassed his Congressional District after the war had been going on for months, pledging support of it, sometimes in the presence of the volunteers themselves; his election 'as the friend and supporter of the war;' his attempt in Congress by means of the spot resolutions, to 'put the American people *in the wrong* and the Mexican enemy *in the right*' — and that, too, when peace nego-

[1] Herndon, Springfield, to Trumbull, July 22, 1858. *Ib.*

[2] See Vol. II, Chap. III. [3] June 23, 1858.

[4] *Chicago Tribune*, June 25, 1858. On July 1 the *Daily Democratic Press* was consolidated with the *Tribune* and on July 3 appeared the first issue of the *Chicago Press and Tribune*.

[5] *Ib.*, July 14, 1858.

tiations were under way after an unbroken series of American victories; the 'jeers' of the House and 'scorn and derision of the country.' The paper reproduced the one-time popular jingle about Lincoln and his resolutions:

'Mr. Speaker! Spot! Spot! Spot!
Mr. Speaker! Where's the Spot?
Is it in Spain or is it not?
Mr. Speaker! Spot! Spot! Spot!'

Like 'the blue-light federalists in the war of 1812,' Lincoln voted that the Mexican War had been 'unnecessarily and unconstitutionally' begun by the President, and that, therefore, our soldiers 'were nothing but BUTCHERERS AND MURDERERS;' yet in his speech in the House Lincoln admitted that he had not 'examined the question as to whether his country was right or wrong until his arrival in Washington.' The war had been in progress for nearly two years before Lincoln so much as 'looked into the origin and history' of it, or 'could tell whether his country was right or wrong.' What a confession for a public man to make! [1]

Other Democratic papers followed the lead of the Springfield organ and printed, with acrid comment, the old resolutions against Lincoln passed by public meetings ten years before. 'This was the popular verdict then as to Mr. Lincoln's course,' said the *Ottawa Free Trader;* [2] 'the people of the State do remember it, and will "rebuke" it, when their ballots are to be deposited in November.' The taunts stung. Instantly the Republican paper at Springfield made hot reply [3] and continued it for several days. Lincoln had voted for supplies for the American troops, and, as to the Ashmun resolution, the war *was* a bad one.[4] Yet, on this particular matter and as a question of votes, it is obvious that the Democratic papers had the better of the argument, for they kept at it throughout the campaign with

[1] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 16, 1858. This and other Democratic papers had been attacking Lincoln's war record for some time, but the editorial quoted in the text was the most comprehensive and careful. Republican papers did not answer it, except that the *Chicago Press and Tribune* said that the Mexican War was unjust.

[2] July 23, 1858. [3] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 17, 1858.

[4] *Ib.*, July 28, 1858.

aggressiveness and zest, while the Republican press was defensive, reluctant, and angry.

With all his handicaps Douglas was making headway. Thus far Lincoln and the Republicans were not holding up to the fight. Everywhere the Douglas men were rallying to their chief. The old line Whigs of Central and Southern Illinois who refused to follow Lincoln two years before, showed little sign of change of heart, although a few of them had come over to the Republicans, among them Gillespie, who was now running for the Legislature as a Republican in Lincoln's interest. But the Know-Nothings, now 'Americans,' were turning to Douglas. Gillespie, badly 'scared,' wrote to Lincoln a 'doleful letter.'

'We must not lose the district,' said Lincoln in reply. 'Lay hold of the proper agencies, and secure all the Americans you can, at once.' Lincoln had just come back from a series of conferences with Judd and the Republican managers in Chicago, and assured the frightened legislative candidate that 'other agencies' would be set to work to counteract the loss of the American vote. 'Don't fail to check the stampede at once.' Trumbull would soon come to his aid and 'I have reason to hope there will be other help of an appropriate kind.' [1]

A German editor of Alton, Theodore Canisius, who often wrote to Trumbull of his importance and need of money,[2] now advised the Senator that 'Mr. Lincoln is pretty sure to win.' [3]

[1] Lincoln to Gillespie, Springfield, July 25, 1858. *Works*, III, 192–3.

It was the same elsewhere: 'The battle of republicanism is now being fought in Minnesota, and the friends of liberty elsewhere must lend a helping hand — must afford *material aid*, . . . or it will be crushed in the onslaught.' A. Nourse (of Bath, Me.) to Trumbull, St. Anthony, Minn., July 24, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

From the first, Lincoln's hardest task was to get the support of both Know-Nothings and Germans. One party worker wrote to Trumbull that in his county (St. Clair) Republican candidates for the Legislature must not be Germans because the Americans would not vote for 'foreigners.' J. F. Alexander to Trumbull, Sept. 12, 1857. *Ib.*

[2] For instance, April 12, 1858, telling about his papers at Alton and Springfield, that he is hard up and must have help — and that Republican victory was as 'certain as daylight.' *Ib.* Both journals had short lives. The *Freie Presse* of Alton, established in 1858 by Canisius, was with the second isssue transferred to Christian Schneider, who conducted it about a year. The *Illinois Staats Anzeiger* did not appear in Springfield until June, 1859, and continued to be printed until Lincoln appointed Canisius in 1861 U.S. Consul at Vienna. The Springfield paper was made possible only by money advanced by Lincoln for press and types. See Barton, I, 421–3.

[3] Canisius, Alton, to Trumbull, July 19, 1858. Canisius bragged of his editorials; they were copied all over the country he said. Trumbull MSS.

Canisius is later to play a leading rôle for a brief moment in Lincoln's life, and then to become a concealed local force in his election to the Presidency.

The Administration forces were working hard against Douglas and in harmony with the Republican organization. In spite of his public repudiation of Buchanan's post-office inspector in Illinois, Charles Leib, as 'no man of ours,' that general agent of the 'National Democracy' reported to Trumbull: 'Douglas is . . . making a desperate effort to recover his position. . . . I am in correspondence with a number of gentlemen who are now openly with us, men who like myself will fight him to the *bitter end*. . . . In all the central counties and probably in all we [Administration Democrats] will have candidates for the Legislature. With the result we have nothing to do. . . . If the Republicans succeed in electing, the fault is that of the Douglas men.' [1]

Conservative New York papers could see no hope for Douglas; he himself knew that his chances were 'exceedingly slim.' The Democratic split and the confidence of the Republicans showed that they would win. Even if the Administration Democrats should go over to Douglas, he must lose; for the election of 1856 proved that there was 'a decided anti-democratic majority in Illinois.' [2] The truth was that Douglas had made a great mistake in fighting the President on the Kansas muddle: 'Had he sustained the President upon that issue . . . it would have placed him foremost in the front rank of his party for the Presidential succession.' [3] Even Greeley was sure that, since Douglas had made popular sovereignty his battle cry, 'he cannot fail to be beaten.' [4]

Undismayed, Douglas had assumed the offensive, as was his wont — he had taken charge as he said he would do,[5] and was

[1] Charles Leib, Chicago, to Trumbull, July 20, 1858. *Ib.* Leib tells Trumbull the program of the 'regular Democrats' — a speaker to trail Douglas; former Governor Reynolds had established a newspaper, the *Star of Egypt*, and was already 'firing hot shot into the Douglasites,' etc.

Incidentally, Leib suggested that Trumbull protect him from Douglas's charges: 'If a letter from most of the prominent Postmasters in the State . . . giving him the lie direct have no weight, I can only say, *let the axe fall.*'

[2] *New York Herald*, July 27, 1858. [3] *Ib.*, July 22, 1858.

[4] New York Weekly *Tribune*, July 12, 1858.

[5] Bloomington speech.

forcing the fighting. At the Douglas headquarters in Springfield, he and his State Chairman, John Moore, made up a list of speaking appointments and published it. They covered a great part of the State and included almost every day for many weeks. At once Lincoln and his committee arranged and announced counter meetings for him, some of them for the same day and place where Douglas was to speak, others for the same place on the following day.[1]

In New York, Trumbull had begun his assault on his colleague and was speeding westward; and the Republican press of the East was giving him more notice as the real antagonist of Douglas, saying almost nothing about Lincoln. 'ILLINOIS, TRUMBULL and DOUGLAS' ran the head lines of the *Boston Traveler*.[2] Moreover, Douglas in his speeches was now paying more attention to his colleague than to Lincoln.[3]

Douglas papers scoffed and raged at Lincoln's tactics in 'trailing' his opponent — that was the only way he could get a crowd, they said.[4] Republican managers, and voters too, were not heartened by the methods of their candidate — the offensive must be taken away from Douglas, and Lincoln alone could do it. They insisted that he challenge Douglas to a joint debate.[5] At the beginning of the fight, Greeley had suggested it in his long editorial on the Lincoln-Douglas speeches in Chicago.[6] First in Illinois to urge this aggressive course was Jesse Fell of

[1] Stevens, 551.

[2] As quoted by Professor Sparks in his 'Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858,' *Ill. State Hist. Coll.*, III; *Lincoln Series*, I, 58.

Some Illinois Republicans were for Trumbull for President in 1860. J. F. Alexander to Trumbull, Sept. 12, 1857. Trumbull MSS. G. Garland, Attila, Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 20, 1858. *Ib.* Bryant thought Trumbull a better man than Lincoln: 'For Mr. Lincoln I know the people have great respect and great confidence in his ability and integrity. Still the feeling here is that you have filled the place . . . better than he could have done.' John H. Bryant to Trumbull, Feb. 12, 1857. *Ib.*

[3] Stevens, 552.

[4] And see *Era:* Cole, 169. Professor Cole says that his failure to get crowds and general complaints of his 'trailing' Douglas were the reasons for his challenge.

On Sept. 3, 1858, Lincoln wrote to William Fithian: 'My recent experience shows that speaking at the same place the next day after D[ouglas] is the very thing — it is, in fact, a concluding speech on him.' *Works*, III, 348.

[5] Herndon, II, 401.

[6] New York *Tribune*, July 12, 1858. 'We trust Messrs. Lincoln and Douglas will speak together at some fifteen or twenty of the most important and widely accessible points throughout the State.'

Bloomington, now Secretary of the Republican State Central Committee and one of the most unselfish friends Lincoln ever had.[1] Finally the *Chicago Press and Tribune* forced the issue. 'Let Mr. Douglas and Mr. Lincoln agree to canvass the State together, in the usual western style' — but doubtless Douglas would 'run away from him as he did in 1854.'[2]

At last, Lincoln yielded and went to Chicago to talk the matter over with the Republican State Chairman and other party strategists in that city. Douglas was there, too, getting ready to start on his long speaking tour already announced in the press. One week after the Springfield speech to which we have just listened, Lincoln wrote to Douglas: 'Will it be agreeable to you to make an arrangement for you and myself to divide time, and address the same audiences the present canvass? Mr. Judd, who will hand you this, is authorized to receive your answer; and, if agreeable to you, to enter into the terms of such arrangement.'[3]

Douglas was reluctant — such a debate would only advertise Lincoln to the country. 'Between you and me, I do not feel that I want to go into this debate,' he said to friends. 'The whole country knows me and has me measured. Lincoln, as regards myself, is comparatively unknown, and if he gets the best of this debate — and I want to say he is the ablest man the Republicans have got — I shall lose everything. Should I win, I shall gain but little. I do not want to go into a debate with Lincoln.'[4]

With unconcealed joy, the Republican press announced that Lincoln had sent the challenge, and intimated that Douglas would decline it and branded him as a coward if he should do so.[5] Since he must act, Douglas did so at once. On the day Lincoln's challenge was handed to him, he made answer; appointments for Democratic meetings had been made 'covering the entire period until late in October;' the people had been notified and Democratic candidates for Congress and other offices had arranged to be present, and they, with Douglas, would necessarily take up the whole time.

[1] Statement of James S. Ewing, Feb. 12, 1909. MS. Jesse Fell Memorial.

[2] *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 22, 1858.

[3] Lincoln to Douglas, Chicago, July 24, 1858. *Works*, III, 189.

[4] Stevens, 553. [5] *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 26, 1858.

To embarrass Douglas and confuse his supporters, the Republican press printed a story that he was about to withdraw so as to unite the Democrats on Justice Sidney Breese of the State Supreme Court, as the compromise candidate of the party.[1] The tale was a mere campaign trick, and Douglas now turned it against those who had invented and spread it. Assuming the falseness of the report and in that fashion thus advising his followers to that effect, Douglas also assumed that the plan to make Breese a third candidate was true. So he said to Lincoln:

'It has been suggested recently that an arrangement had been made to bring out a third candidate . . . , who, with yourself, should canvass the State in opposition to me, with no other purpose than to insure my defeat, by dividing the Democratic party for your benefit.' So if Douglas agreed to debate with Lincoln, it was more than likely that this other candidate, 'who has a common object with you,' would demand to speak at the same time, and thus 'he and you in concert might be able to take the opening and closing speech in every case.' [2]

Why had Lincoln waited until after Douglas's appointments had been made and published, if from the first he had intended

[1] *Illinois Daily State Journal*, July 3, *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 14, *Alton Morning Courier*, July 17, *Chicago Democrat*, July 24, 1858, etc. Lincoln was in Springfield and Chicago when this story first appeared in the papers of those towns. Herndon to Trumbull, July 8, 1858, and Douglas's statement in this letter in answer to Lincoln.

Wentworth's paper made editorial note of the announcement of Breese's candidacy by the *Star of Egypt:* 'Judge Breese is a very strong man . . . his suffering his name to be used in this connection shows that the Buchanan men are fast gathering strength in all parts of the State. They have already, in this quarter, (Chicago and Northern Ill.) called around them the oldest veterans and choicest spirits of the party. . . . Poor Douglas!' *Chicago Democrat*, July 24, 1858.

Breese, who had been in the Senate with Douglas and had been defeated by Shields for a second term, had just been reëlected to the Supreme Court by a great majority. B. J. J. Hanna to Trumbull, Alton, Ill., Nov. 14, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

Breese was a man of uncommon ability, a fine lawyer and highly educated. He hated Douglas because of disagreements in the Senate and, especially, because Douglas did not come to his rescue when Shields beat him. Justice Breese was a staunch supporter of the Administration, and had been selected as the candidate of the 'regular' Democrats for the Senate in case the Legislature should have an anti-Douglas majority which, at this time, seemed to be certain. During the campaign Breese wrote three open letters against Douglas which were published in the 'regular' Democratic papers and the Republican press.

[2] The Eastern press took more notice of this point than of the whole Lincoln-Douglas correspondence. For instance: 'Mr. Douglas is a little afraid that the other democratic candidate may come into the arrangement and place the Little Giant between two fires — after the fashion of Maryatt's triangular duel.' *New York Herald*, July 30, 1858.

to ask for joint debates? Both men had been in Chicago for several days after Douglas returned; they had been together, too, at other places, notably at Springfield, 'where it was well known I went for the purpose of consulting with the State Central Committee, and agreeing upon the plan of the campaign.'

Although, under these circumstances, Douglas did not like to upset the arrangement of other Democratic candidates, already made and advertised, still he would take the responsibility in order to 'accommodate' Lincoln as far as he could. So let a place in each Congressional District, except the two where both had already spoken,[1] be agreed on — and Douglas suggested, as the most convenient towns, Freeport, Ottawa, Galesburg, Quincy, Alton, Jonesboro, and Charleston. As soon as possible he would talk with Lincoln about the dates and details, wrote Douglas; but where meetings had already been arranged by the Democratic State Committee, at any town where their debate was to take place, 'I must insist upon your meeting me at the time specified.' [2]

What 'a long-winded, pettifogging reply,' said Republican papers — 'The little dodger shirks, and backs out, except at half a dozen places which he himself selects! . . . The "little dodger" is afraid of "Long Abe" on the stump.' [3]

The Douglas press seized upon the point of Lincoln's delay in challenging Douglas. He had had time and to spare if he was so eager for the fray; why wait until Douglas's appointments had been made and advertised, why 'banter for battle' only when he knew Douglas could not meet him every day? But he had the chance now to debate seven times. 'If he was good for fifty or a hundred encounters, he certainly ought to be for seven.' At least, he would get crowds in that way; but would Lincoln accept? [4]

[1] The 2nd District, Chicago, and the 6th District, Springfield.

[2] Douglas to Lincoln, Chicago, July 24, 1858. *Works*, III, 189–92.

[3] *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 28, 1858. 'He would rather go about the country like a strolling mountebank, with his cannon, todies and puffers, to shoot, cheer and blow for him, than to stand up to the work with a full grown man to confront him.' This editorial is very vindictive.

[4] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 29, 31, 1858.

He would and did. Five days later Lincoln, now at Springfield, wrote to Douglas as long a letter as Douglas had written to him. Though they had dined together the very day before, Lincoln did not know Douglas had made answer to his challenge, he claimed, until he saw it in the *Chicago Times* just before leaving for Springfield; only when he got home did he receive the original. That, he explained, was why he had not answered at once.

Douglas's 'insinuations' about Lincoln's 'unfairness' were unjust; he had never heard that a third candidate for the Senate was to be brought out — Douglas, himself, must have made that 'suggestion.' Surely Douglas had not 'deliberately' concluded that Lincoln and a third candidate were acting in concert to get openings and closings and thus entrap Douglas.

As to his delay in sending the challenge: 'I made it as soon as I resolved to make it.' Further, Lincoln declared that he had thought that perhaps Douglas would do so first, and had waited 'respectfully' to see. He did not know that Douglas went to Springfield to arrange his plan of campaign. Not until Douglas's appointments 'extending only to the 21st of August' were published, did Lincoln realize, 'for the first time,' that Douglas would not challenge him, and he then decided to challenge Douglas. So he had written to Douglas as soon as he could consult with friends 'satisfactorily.'

Lincoln said that it did not 'occur' to him that the debates would interfere with Douglas's appointments, since there were over two months of 'clear time,' after Douglas's last meeting as announced in the press. In a long paragraph, Lincoln pointed out the advantages Douglas had had over him at Chicago, Bloomington, and Springfield; but finally agreed to the places named by Douglas, and 'at your own times.' Lincoln added an important postscript that he would not again be at any of Douglas's 'exclusive meetings.' [1]

At last the dates were settled to begin at Ottawa, August 21, where Douglas was to speak at a Democratic meeting that day, he to open and close there, Lincoln to open and close the next

[1] Lincoln to Douglas, Springfield, July 29, 1858. *Works*, III, 193–6.

debate at Freeport, August 27, and so on — opening speeches to be one hour long, replies one hour and a half, rejoinder half an hour.[1] Lincoln complained that Douglas took 'four openings and closes to my three,' but agreed.[2] The junior partner was uneasy: 'I fear . . . that personalities will creep into the debates,' he wrote to Parker.[3] Prophetic words!

But all this was not done through formal letters sent by mail. We are here caught in another of those curious tangles that so often confuse the student of Lincoln's career. A spectator wrote to the *State Register*[4] that Douglas was on the road to Bement from Monticello where he had just spoken, and met Lincoln going there. In jocular humor, Douglas asked Lincoln to go back to Bement with him — he would give his opponent a bigger crowd there than Lincoln would find at Monticello. No, said Lincoln, he did not come to speak, but only to give Douglas the long letter already reviewed. But handbills had been posted on the trees where Douglas had just spoken and scattered over Monticello, announcing that Lincoln would follow Douglas — so he went on and spoke in the same grove soon after the Douglas meeting was over.

According to another story printed twenty-six years after the incident, Douglas saw Lincoln and his party coming from Bement. 'There comes Lincoln,' said Douglas, 'I wish to speak to him a moment.' When they came abreast, he spoke to Lincoln and asked: 'Did you receive my letter?' Lincoln said yes. What do you think of it? 'Favorably,' was the response; where could Lincoln see Douglas when he returned from Monticello? At the house of F. E. Bryant, at Bement, where he and Mrs. Douglas were stopping, said Douglas. So when Lincoln's Monticello meeting was over, he went back to Bement and in the parlor of the Bryant residence the two men arranged the dates and details of their joint meetings. In any case, it was at the Monticello-Bement meeting that Lincoln delivered in person his letter to Douglas dated at Springfield on the same day; and

[1] Douglas to Lincoln, Bement, Piatt Co., July 30, 1858. *Ib.*, 196–7.

[2] Lincoln to Douglas, Springfield, July 31, 1858. *Ib.*, 197.

[3] Herndon to Parker, Springfield, July 24, 1858. Newton, 186.

[4] 'Piatt,' writing from Monticello, Ill., July 29, 1858, in *Illinois State Register*, Aug. 2, 1858.

Douglas wrote the formal answer, as given in the text at Bryant's house next morning.[1]

The press on either side exalted its champion, and traduced his antagonist. Lincoln was the master, Douglas had tried to 'dodge,' he had refused to meet Lincoln everywhere because he was afraid of him, exclaimed the Republican papers.[2] Perhaps Lincoln might get people to listen to him now that he was to speak with Douglas; that was what he was after, retorted the Douglas organs. See how he had dogged the Senator's steps, going only where Douglas went and at the same time, if he could.

How impertinent for Lincoln to say that he had expected Douglas to challenge him! how absurd, how obviously false! Lincoln, a contestant for Douglas's place, and a poor one at that! Why on earth should Douglas do the challenging? Yet that was the reason Lincoln gave for his delay! Talk about 'dodging' — what was that but dodging, unless it was a plain lie? It was indeed both. So stormed the Douglas press.

It was 'silly' to say that the Little Giant was afraid: 'The idea that a man who has crossed blades in the senate with the strongest intellects of the country . . . and routed all opposition . . . dreads encounter with Mr. A. Lincoln is an absurdity.'[3] But the Republican rank and file 'cheered his [Lincoln's] name to the echo,' relates Carl Schurz;[4] at last their leader was going to fight at close quarters.

[1] *History of Bement*, Ill.: Geo. L. Spear, 1878.

Also statement of F. E. Bryant to F. M. Shonkwiler of Monticello who wrote an account similar to that of Spear. MSS. in possession of J. F. Sprague, Bement, Ill., present owner of the Bryant house, to whom the author is indebted for this data.

In the Shonkwiler narrative it is said that Bryant and his wife took Douglas and Mrs. Douglas to Monticello in the Bryant carriage, and on the way back to Bement met Lincoln and his party in a 'prairie schooner' and the arrangement to meet at Bryant's house was made as related by Spear; that Lincoln came to Bryant's house about eleven o'clock that night when all were in bed, rapped on the door until Bryant let him in; that Bryant then awakened Douglas who came downstairs in his night-shirt; and that he and Lincoln talked over the debates for half an hour in the parlor.

[2] 'We said from the first that Douglas would not dare canvass the State with Lincoln. He had run away from that gentleman in 1854. . . . If he dared not meet Lincoln in the first dawnings of his conspiracy to Africanise the American continent, of course he would object still more to such a canvass in 1858, when the evidences of that conspiracy are so numerous and overwhelming that even his audacity shrinks from denying it.' *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 29, 1858.

[3] *Illinois Daily State Register*, July 31, 1858. [4] Schurz, II, 88.

From this time on for the remainder of the campaign, the press of Illinois gives little or no aid to the searcher after truth. Both sides were violently partisan, both lied with that relish and audacity which at that time were thought to be required by true party zeal. Republican and Douglas papers said exactly opposite things of the very same meeting. According to one, Lincoln 'crushed' Douglas everywhere; according to the other, Douglas was everywhere triumphant. The reader of one paper would learn that Lincoln got all the applause, and read in the other paper that Douglas was greeted with storms of cheers which continued throughout his speech and became an ovation at the end. Lincoln 'captured' the crowd at every meeting and so did Douglas. One quaked, trembled, and almost fell beneath the blows rained upon him, and the other had an identical experience — all at the same meeting. The crowd was hot with enthusiasm or cold with indifference, according to the politics of the paper printing the story. Lincoln and Douglas processions were each always twice as long as the other. The student may search for months the partisan newspapers of the time and he will find that they agree on nothing except the weather and perhaps the size of the crowds.

For a distant approach to impartiality and truth, we must rely upon the outside press, and even those papers were infected. Now and then we have descriptions that are faithful, from some one on the ground who kept his head; and these, together with narratives of eyewitnesses written from notes taken at the time, but long after passion had cooled and honest judgment could be given, make up the scanty evidence upon which we have to depend.

Solely on their merits, the debates themselves deserve little notice. For the most part, each speaker merely repeated what he had said before. Few and unimportant were the points made to which we have not already listened more than once. But the debates served to advertise Lincoln to the country and thus made possible his nomination for the Presidency — or, rather, added the final and indispensable element which rendered that outcome certain.

Like all personal encounters, the debates drew the crowds,

appealed to the fighting instinct, aroused the followers of each champion to that pitch of emotion wholly without thought or sense, always displayed in any sort of close contest when the spectators have taken sides. The sporting quality of men, while not a major factor, must be kept in mind, when witnessing this or any hot political fight.

It may be helpful at this point to look at the combatants once more. Physically and mentally, Lincoln and Douglas were exactly opposite types. Douglas was short and thick-set, with great depth and breadth of chest, big round face, firm wide mouth, powerful square jaws, strong muscular neck, large and brilliant blue eyes, a mighty head and a deep voice. Lincoln was very tall and thin, with narrow chest and drooping shoulders, a long, slender, wrinkled neck, a lined and withered face, shrunken cheeks, small head, and shrill voice.

Lincoln was humorous and quizzical, indifferent to or forgetful of his clothes which never fitted, slow of thought and action, given to moods of melancholy broken by strange and sudden bursts of fun, and he was the best story-teller in the country. Douglas was cordial and dignified, alert, quick, and resourceful, careful of his dress; but he could not tell a story or crack a joke and never tried to do so.

As speakers the quality of both men is shown by what they said. Each was scrupulously honest, personally, although the followers of each denied that the other was overloaded with that virtue. Both were strong for the Union, both intensely patriotic, facts that we shall see emerge in flaming grandeur when the stern and decisive hour shall come.

Lincoln and Douglas were inordinately ambitious, politically; but Lincoln had for the most part failed, while Douglas had mounted on eagle's wings with never a let down, never a halt. In 1858 the name of Douglas was known to every man and woman in the whole land, while that of Lincoln, though familiar to Republican politicians in other States, had not been heard by the masses of the people outside of Illinois. The hold of Douglas on his followers everywhere was absolute. He was an idol to them; their devotion amounted to a frenzy; they acted as if under a spell.

'You were once a Douglas Democrat were you not?' was asked of one of his adherents many years after he died.

'Yes, by God, and I am a Douglas Democrat now,' came the answer, quick and sharp.[1]

And now Douglas needed this attachment and every resource he could command. Seldom in political history has any man faced a situation so desperate. All the power and prestige of the President of his party were against him. On one hand he was assailed by the Administration forces and old line Democrats who could not forgive even Douglas for breaking with his party in Congress; on the other hand by the Republican party of Illinois, fresh, eager, bellicose, and led by their ablest man.[2] His enemies were as hot against him as his friends were eager for him, and could find no words black enough to express their feelings. No one ever was indifferent to Douglas, no one even moderate; he was either loved or hated.

Then, too, hard times ground the people all over the State,[3] and, while nothing was said about them in the campaign, the psychological effect was the same that it always is. Worse still, crops in Illinois were 'almost a total failure,' as the editor of the

[1] The late Thomas R. Marshall, when Vice President, to Louis Howland and by him to the author, March, 1927.

'His followers loved to obey him for their love of the man.' Stevens, 422.

'About two-thirds of the voters of this county would vote for Douglas for anything that he would ask of them.' I. M. Grant, Mt. Vernon, Ill., to Trumbull, Sept. 15, 1857. 'The party almost unanimously swear by him.' John Tillson, Quincy, Ill., to Trumbull, Dec. 20, 1857. Joshua Guilford of Shelbyville, Ill., wrote to Trumbull, Dec. 27, 1857, that Douglas's friends would stick to him even when they knew him to be in the wrong and more earnestly when they believed him to be in the right. Most Democrats were for Douglas even more than for the Democratic Party. A. Kitchell (no place given) to Trumbull, Apr. 23, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[2] 'In the political world everybody's attention is absorbed by the canvass for the Illinois election . . . where Senator Douglas will have to struggle against a host of foes. . . . He will have to encounter the unrelenting hostility of his old friends, as well as of the Republicans. . . . This division in the ranks of the Democrats gives the Republicans a better chance of victory in Illinois than ever they have had before' and the defeat of Douglas 'would create the most tremendous "sensation" of latter days.' E. L. Godkin's despatch to the *London Daily News*, July 13, 1858. *Life of Edwin Lawrence Godkin:* Rollo Ogden, I, 177.

[3] 'Business still continues prostrate and collections difficult to make.' B. F. Barry, Alton, Ill., to Trumbull, Jan. 5, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

'Our market is dead. Not a single hog has yet been packed,' etc. Geo. T. Brown to Trumbull, undated 1858. *Ib.*

From April 1 to Oct. 1, 1858, there were seventy-two commercial failures in Illinois for $1,224,000. *New York Herald*, Oct. 14, 1858. And see *ib.*, Oct. 25, 1858, on continuance

Press and Tribune informed Trumbull; 'the times are gloomy and the prospect dull,' people complain of high taxes and big public expenses. Let Trumbull 'go into the finances of the Administration rough-shod.' [1]

For a quarter of a century Douglas had been in office continuously and for fourteen years he had necessarily spent most of his time in Washington. In visits to Illinois between sessions of Congress, he had seen as many people as he could at country fairs and other public gatherings, but this personal contact had been scant and brief. He had been able only to keep firm hand on the party organization and maintain close relations with Democratic politicians. Moreover, Douglas was said to have become a rich man since he went to Congress, and this was true, for he was far-seeing in business and had made wise investments in real estate; but a reputation for wealth, gained however honestly, while in office, is not helpful in a fight for votes.

Finally rumor had it that he was a drinking man, and this did not commend him to the 'temperance people,' who were numerous and active.[2] The fact that his wife went with him everywhere was, said the Republicans, to counteract the effect of his evil personal habits.

Mrs. Douglas threw herself into the campaign with an ardor equal to that of her husband. At every town, every village, she joined the Democratic women as one of them, and took cordial part in all they did. While her simple heartiness and charm had good effect on those whom she was able to meet in this fashion, it may be questioned whether her presence did not do Douglas more harm than good. Whether the crowds of country women, hard-working wives and daughters of hard-working farmers situated as they were at that day, and with the means of education then available, would be attracted rather than repelled by gazing at this exquisite, fashionably dressed woman from Washing-

of hard times in New York. Also New York *Tribune*, Jan. 22, 1858, on result of panic: 'Its disastrous effects have by no means been fully realized and proclaimed.'

'Why is it that business does not revive?' *New York Herald*, Oct. 18, 1858.

[1] C. H. Ray to Trumbull, Chicago, July 17, 1858. Trumbull MSS.

[2] In addition to demands for prohibition laws, some wanted Congress to prevent importation of liquor by a prohibitory tariff. J. D. Hartzler (speaking for 'temperance people' of Danville, Ill.) to Trumbull, Aug. 13, 1857. Trumbull MSS.

ton, is doubtful to say the least.[1] Worse still, she was a Roman Catholic, then a term of terror to most Protestants, especially in the rural districts. Douglas must be a Catholic, too, the Republican press had suggested soon after the wedding.[2] Protestant ministers had not forgiven Douglas — never did forgive him — for his attacks upon them and the Know-Nothings four years earlier,[3] and they were now an untiring force against him.

Political hurdles were also in Lincoln's way; but they were few and low compared with the obstacles that Douglas had to overcome. Chief of Lincoln's difficulties was the support of Douglas by Senator Crittenden of Kentucky, who, as we have seen, was the most eminent of the old line Whigs and Americans — their leader in fact.[4] He liked Douglas, admired his courage in fighting the Administration and was politically indebted to him for his ardent support of the Crittenden amendment. So the Kentucky Senator's great influence with the old line Whigs and Americans of Illinois, was thrown to Douglas. As a political matter, and that was all it then was, it is hard to see how Crittenden could have taken any other course.

The coolness of Eastern Republicans did not hurt Lincoln much. Indeed, their insistence before Lincoln was made the formal Republican candidate for Senator that Douglas should be reëlected helped Lincoln, for it angered Illinois Republicans to the fighting pitch. When Lincoln was put in the field, outside Republican opposition to him stopped.

As a matter of getting votes, Lincoln's advantage over Douglas was marked. He had the reputation of being a very poor man; the story of his humble birth, his early struggles, his self-extrication from the bog of misfortunes had been told innumer-

[1] After his Chicago speech, Douglas introduced his wife to Villard in Douglas's rooms in the hotel, and the young correspondent thus describes her: 'While we were talking, his newly-wedded second wife came in through a side door, and I was introduced to her. She was at once a most lovely and a queenly apparition. Indeed, it seemed to me that I had never seen a woman more beautiful in every way. Her tall figure was perfectly proportioned, and her every movement and gesture most graceful. She presented a marked contrast, in her youthful, blooming freshness and vivacity, to her small, dark, sombre husband.' Villard, I, 91–2.

[2] *Chicago Journal*, Dec. 2, 1856. [3] See Vol. III, Chap. IV.

[4] Crittenden's letter to T. Lyle Dickey in praise of Douglas was frequently printed by Democratic papers during the campaign. Lincoln admitted that the use of Crittenden's name had 'contributed largely' to his defeat. *Works*, V, 91.

able times, and did not grow less in the telling. Above all, the popular belief in his honesty counted heavily in his favor — 'Honest Old Abe,' the people called him. Most people had faith in what he said, had faith in the man. It was the strongest single personal factor in the campaign.

Then, while Douglas had been away most of the time, Lincoln had been at home all of the time. He had met the people at every session of the court in the counties of his judicial district, told stories to their liking, made hosts of friends. Whenever he could get a chance, he had made speeches and never failed to please the crowd. Neither on the circuit nor in speech-making trips did Mrs. Lincoln go with him. His sadness as well as his humor appealed to all who met him. From every point of view, Lincoln was a man of the people.

CHAPTER V

THE GREAT DEBATE

I have stood by my principles in fair weather and in foul, in the sunshine and in the rain. I have defended the great principles of self-government here among you when Northern sentiment ran in a torrent against me, and I have defended that same great principle when Southern sentiment came down like an avalanche upon me. . . . I knew I was right. DOUGLAS at Freeport, Aug. 27, 1858.

I confess myself as belonging to that class in the country who contemplate slavery as a moral, social, and political evil, having due regard for its actual existence amongst us and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and to all the constitutional obligations which have been thrown about it; but, nevertheless, desire a policy that looks to the prevention of it as a wrong, and looks hopefully to the time when as a wrong it may come to an end. LINCOLN at Galesburg, Oct. 7, 1858.

TERMS of the debates fixed, both men again took the stump. Everywhere Lincoln followed Douglas, speaking at the same place on the same day, or on the next. Sometimes he arrived while the Douglas meeting was going on, Republicans leaving the crowd about the speaker's stand to greet their hero with cheers. Even when Lincoln was not to speak, he went to hear Douglas whenever he could and mingled with the throng.[1]

According to the testimony of the chief organ of the party, the Republican campaign was planned with utmost care. Every move, every speech, was made with a definite purpose which had been thought out and agreed upon beforehand. Judging by his acts and words, Douglas did the same thing. His obvious course was to take and hold the offensive; no less important, he must stick to the issues as he had formulated them, and, above all, he must keep in good humor.

Just as obviously, Republican tactics required that Douglas should be put on the defensive, be diverted from his chosen is-

[1] For instance: at Clinton, DeWitt Co. 'I was standing in the crowd when he made his speech.' Lincoln's statement at Beardstown, Aug. 12, 1858. White's report in Herndon and Weik, II, 99.

sues, and, if possible, be made angry. All these things were attempted, but without success except as to the last. Douglas was goaded until his temper broke. On August 7, Trumbull, in Chicago, made a 'ferocious' speech. It was almost wholly a vituperative attack upon Douglas. Not a word did Trumbull say about Lincoln or for him.

Trumbull charged that in 1856, when the Kansas troubles were at their worst, Douglas had entered into a 'plot' to prevent the people of that Territory from voting upon a State Constitution. The Toombs bill of that year provided that the proposed fundamental law should be submitted to the people; but when the bill came out of Douglas's Committee, that clause was stricken out. This revelation was greeted by loud cheers. 'I will cram the truth down any honest man's throat, until he cannot deny it. [Renewed cheers.] And to the man who does deny it, I will cram the lie down his throat, until he shall cry enough. [Tremendous cheering.]' Yet Douglas was now claiming credit for defeating the Lecompton Constitution on that very ground, said Trumbull. 'It is the most damnable effrontery that man ever put on, to conceal a scheme to defraud and cheat a people out of their right, and then claim credit for it. [Cries, "Hurrah for Trumbull, hit him again. Down with all such men."]' [1]

Trumbull was repeating a charge made by the spokesman of the Administration in the Senate, William Bigler of Pennsylvania, early in the Lecompton fight. Douglas had forced Bigler to retract at the time.[2] The incident had been dramatic and with promise of another such scene as that when Douglas had castigated Sumner and Chase. Throughout the quarrel, Trumbull had listened in silence. But now on the stump he was bitter and bold. Presently we shall hear Lincoln reiterate Trumbull's charge.

Lincoln had twice repeated the Republican indictment of Douglas as a conspirator with two Presidents and the Supreme Court to spread slavery over the whole land; but, holding his

[1] *Chicago Press and Tribune*, Aug. 8, 1858. Also campaign pamphlet issued by the National Republican Association in Washington, D.C.

[2] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Pt. 1, 21–2, 113–22.

temper down, Douglas had treated it with tolerant indifference.[1] But now Trumbull and Lincoln combined at last aroused his wrath. As soon as Douglas read Trumbull's speech he denounced his colleague as a coward and a liar. 'The miserable, craven-hearted wretch, he would rather have both ears cut off than to use that language in my presence, where I could call him to account.' As to Lincoln's conspiracy charge, that, shouted the enraged Douglas, was simply 'an infamous lie.' [2]

The day after this outburst, Lincoln spoke at the same place. A big crowd, mostly old time Whigs,[3] was there. Lincoln's speech was one of the best he ever made, testifies White, who went with the Republican candidate everywhere as correspondent of the *Chicago Press and Tribune*. 'Taking it for granted that Judge Douglas was satisfied to take his chances in the campaign with the imputation of conspiracy hanging over him,' said Lincoln, he had renewed the charge at Springfield. Not until Douglas made his fourth speech of the canvass at 'a small town, Clinton' did he take notice of the indictment; and then all that he said was that '"self-respect alone prevented him from calling it a falsehood."'

So Lincoln again went over the items of the Republican indictment. 'I dare Judge Douglas to deny one of them. Let him do so and I will prove them by such testimony as will confound him forever.' It would be better if Douglas would refute specifically each count against him, said Lincoln, 'than to go vociferating about the country that possibly he may hint that somebody is a liar.' [4]

The day after the Beardstown speech, Lincoln, accompanied by the young newspaper man, went up the river on Douglas's trail, on the steamboat *Senator* to Havana. They arrived while Douglas was speaking, and the Chicago reporter went to the meeting, where an angry Republican told him that Douglas must have been drinking, 'because he had called Lincoln "a liar,

[1] See Douglas's Springfield speech of July 17, in Lincoln's *Works*, III, 121–2, 132.

[2] White's statement of Douglas's Beardstown speech, Aug. 11, 1858. Herndon and Weik, II, 95. 'I heard him.'

[3] *Ib.*, 96.

[4] White's report of Lincoln's Beardstown speech in Herndon and Weik, II, 100–1.

a coward, a wretch and a sneak."' So when Lincoln spoke next day, he said that he had been told that Douglas 'became a little excited, nervous (?) perhaps,' on the preceding day and talked about fighting Lincoln; and that a Douglas man in the crowd threw off his coat 'and offered to take the job off Judge Douglas's hands and fight Lincoln himself.' Lincoln declared that he would fight neither Judge Douglas nor his second. To fight would prove nothing, he said; and, moreover, Douglas did not really want to fight him. 'He and I are about the best friends in the world, and when we get together he would no more think of fighting me than of fighting his wife.' So 'we will call it quits.' [1]

On from place to place [2] went Lincoln and the *Press and Tribune* correspondent, 'still following on the heels of the Little Giant,' relates White, until August 21, when the first debate was to be held at Ottawa. Such then was the situation and such the temper of the two men and that of their partisans, when that contest took place. It should be borne in mind that Mrs. Douglas accompanied her husband everywhere, charming all she met. When he observed her at Havana, 'standing with a group of ladies a short distance from the platform on which her husband was speaking,' White declared: 'I thought I had never seen a more queenly face and figure. He saw her often thereafter during the campaign, he testifies, and believed that 'this attractive presence was very helpful to Judge Douglas in the campaign. It is certain,' continues White, 'that the Republicans considered her a dangerous element.' [3]

On August 21, 1858, the sun rose on a scene of commotion in the thriving town of Ottawa and the rich farm lands, thickly

[1] White's report of Lincoln's Beardstown speech in Herndon and Weik, II, 102–3. 'Lincoln says the Judge and he have always been friendly, as much so almost as man and wife; and as both man and wife should not get angry at once in a difficulty, he had determined, now that Judge D. was irritated, to keep in the best of humor. . . . He thought fighting an unprofitable business, it proved nothing; but he would adopt a plan that should prove who was right and who wrong; and in pursuing it, would neither give the lie nor so speak that any gentleman with the reputation, both State and National, of a U. S. Senator, could give the lie to him.' *Illinois State Journal*, Aug. 20, 1858.

[2] Lincoln spoke at Havana, Aug. 14, Bath, a town which, he reminded his hearers, he had laid out, or staked twenty-two years before, Aug. 16, Lewiston, Aug. 17, and Peoria, Aug. 19.

[3] White's statement in Herndon and Weik, II, 103–4.

settled, that surrounded it.[1] Daybreak revealed wagons filled with farmers and their families moving on every road that led to the little city. Here and there were buggies, and men and women came on horseback, too. Many were on foot. As time wore on, more vehicles, horsemen, and pedestrians filled the roads. Soon delegations and cavalcades appeared. Banners, mottoes, flags, floats, and other campaign devices advertised the purpose of the outpouring. The day was hot, the dirt roads very dry, dust rose in thick clouds. By ten o'clock Ottawa was in a haze. But the town was full of noise. Cannon roared, bands played, rural fife and drum corps rattled and shrilled, men shouted and hurrahed. Hurrah for Lincoln! Hurrah for Douglas! Hurrah for Old Abe! Hurrah for Little Dug! Peddlers hawked their wares — Douglas badges, Lincoln badges, hurrah!

Mounted marshals and their aids, elaborate sashes about their waists, dashed to and fro, arranging rival processions to greet and escort their respective chiefs. Nor were the two leaders neglectful of the dramatic. Lincoln came on a special train of fourteen cars crowded with shouting Republicans. It arrived about noon and when the Republican champion alighted a dense crowd sent up such loud and repeated cheers that 'the woods and bluffs rang again.' Into a carriage which the 'fair young ladies of Ottawa' had decorated with evergreens and mottoes climbed Lincoln, and, preceded and followed by military companies, bands, and other units of the political parades of the time, was taken through crowded streets to the house of Mayor Glover, where once more, three 'mighty' cheers were given.

Douglas came from Peru in a grand carriage drawn by four 'splendid' horses. Four miles from Ottawa a reception committee of several hundred horsemen bearing flags and banners met him and escorted him to town. Once more artillery thundered, martial music blared, excited partisans cheered. With utmost difficulty the Douglas carriage and escort made their way through the shouting throng to the Geiger House. The scene quite overcame the correspondent of the *Philadelphia Press* who reported that Douglas 'came like some great deliverer, some

[1] The population of La Salle Co. was 48,272. Ottawa had 6522 people and South Ottawa 1026. *Census.* 1860.

mighty champion who had . . . saved a nation from ruin;' and that the tremendous acclaim from the crowd, repeated again and again, 'seemed to rend the very air.' [1]

At two o'clock the debate began. The crowd filled the square, swarmed over the platform, climbed upon the covering above it. For a long time the reporters could not get places on the stand. Douglas, the light of battle in his eye, looked 'imperiously' over the assemblage, tossing back his heavy mane; Lincoln appeared to be placid and humble. It was a big assemblage; at least twelve thousand people were there.

For the most part Lincoln and Douglas, at Ottawa, in the debates thereafter, and, indeed, throughout the campaign, made the same arguments and statements of fact, to which we have already listened several times. So we shall now and hereafter attend only to the points that were new, or to such old ones, as, newly made, attracted the attention of the country and influenced votes.

In opening the debate Douglas told of the deal between Trumbull and Lincoln in 1854, to dissolve the old Whig and Democratic parties and form the Republican Party, as that deal had been exposed in 1855 by Lincoln's friend, James H. Matheny. Then Douglas read a platform which, he said, had been adopted by the Republican State Convention at Springfield in 1854 — the first Black Republican Convention ever held in Illinois. As we have seen, it was to escape this convention that Lincoln had hastily left that town. Recalling an attack in the House on this platform by Representative Thomas L. Harris,[2] Douglas had written to the editor of the Democratic organ at Springfield for a copy of it; and Lanphier had brought to Ottawa a file of his paper containing the Republican resolutions. But they were not

[1] *Philadelphia Press*, Aug. 26, 1858, in *Debates:* Sparks, 124–6. At this point the radical differences in the newspaper reports become conspicuous. The Douglas papers said that there was no enthusiasm when Lincoln came; the Republican papers declared that such as was shown for Douglas 'was almost wholly confined to Irish Catholics.' *Chicago Press and Tribune*, Aug. 23, 1858. *Ib.*, 134.

On the other hand the *Philadelphia Press*, a Douglas paper, after describing the triumphal entry of Douglas into Ottawa, said: 'How different the enthusiasm manifested for his competitor, Mr. Lincoln; or as he had termed himself, "the living dog." As *his* procession passed the Geiger House there was scarcely a cheer went up. They marched along silently and sorrowfully, as if it were a funeral *cortège* following him to the grave.'

[2] *Cong. Globe*, 34th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, 1274.

those actually adopted by the Republican State Convention at Springfield in 1854; instead they were resolutions adopted by the Kane County Republican Convention at Aurora, and a duplicate of those passed by most Republican meetings in Northern Illinois at that time. The Springfield platform had been greatly toned down in order to get Lincoln and other old line Whigs into the new party. But Douglas did not then know of this difference, nor, as we shall now see, did Lincoln know of it.

The Aurora resolutions pledged the new party to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, to prevent the admission of slave States to the Union, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, to prevent the acquisition of more territory unless slavery was forever excluded from it.[1]

As Douglas read them, shouts of approval arose. 'Black Republicans' might cheer, cried Douglas, but they could not get Lincoln to endorse these pledges. '[Laughter and applause. "Hit him again."]' Yet those resolutions stated the Republican position now — see how the 'Black Republicans cheered them as good Black Republican doctrines!' So let Lincoln answer whether he was pledged to those Republican propositions to-day — and Douglas asked Lincoln specific questions based on the platform he had read.

Lincoln must not evade these questions, Douglas said, but answer now, 'in order that, when I trot him down to lower Egypt, I may put the same questions to him. [Enthusiastic applause.] My principles are the same everywhere. [Cheers, and "Hark."] I can proclaim them alike in the North, the South, the East, and the West. My principles will apply wherever the constitution prevails, and the American flag waves. ["Good," and applause.] I desire to know whether Mr. Lincoln's principles will bear transplanting from Ottawa to Jonesboro.'[2]

He meant nothing disrespectful or unkind to Lincoln, said Douglas; and he briefly recounted their long mutual acquaintance and early struggles. 'I was a school-teacher in the town of Winchester, and he a flourishing grocery- [saloon] keeper in the town of Salem. [Applause and laughter.]' Both young men had gone to the Legislature, related Douglas. 'He was then just as

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 89. [2] *Ib.*, 90.

good at telling an anecdote as now. ["No doubt."] He could beat any of the boys wrestling, or running a foot-race, in pitching quoits or tossing a copper; could ruin more liquor than all the boys of the town together; [uproarious laughter] and the dignity and impartiality with which he presided at a horse-race or fist-fight . . . won the praise of everybody that was present and participated. [Renewed laughter.] I sympathized with him because he was struggling with difficulties, and so was I.'

Then Douglas told how Lincoln dropped from sight after he left the Legislature but 'turned up as a member of Congress' when 'the Abolition tornado swept over the country. . . . Whilst in Congress, he distinguished himself by his opposition to the Mexican war, taking the side of the common enemy against his own country; ["that's true"] and when he returned home he found that the indignation of the people followed him everywhere, and he was again submerged, or obliged to retire into private life, forgotten by his former friends. ["And will be again."]' Then Lincoln emerged once more and helped make the abolition platform that Douglas had just read.

And Trumbull! He who tried to repudiate most of the State debt of Illinois! 'I walked into a public meeting in the hall of the House of Representatives, and replied to his repudiating speeches, and resolutions were carried over his head denouncing repudiation, . . . ["Good" and cheers.] Trumbull's malignity has followed me since I thus defeated his infamous scheme.' [1]

Then Douglas took up Lincoln's house-divided speech: Lincoln had said that the Government could not exist half slave and half free. '[Neither can it.]' Why not? asked Douglas. Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Jay, and the great men of that day made it so, 'and left each State perfectly free to do as it pleased on the subject of slavery. ["Right, right."] Why can it not exist on the same principles on which our fathers made it? ["It can."]' Douglas then went on to make the arguments with which we are so familiar, until told that his time was up; and 'three times three cheers' were given for him when he closed.

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 91–2.

When Lincoln rose to make reply, his partisans, who outnumbered those of Douglas two to one, said the Republican press, cheered him so loudly for several minutes that he could not be heard. He denied the deal between himself and Trumbull '[cheers;]' but said that he had no doubt that Douglas had been '*conscientious*' in repeating the falsehood. Of course Lincoln had nothing to do with the Republican resolutions which Douglas had read, he asserted. True, Lovejoy, 'who is here upon this stand,' had 'tried to get me into it, and I would not go in, [cheers and laughter.] . . . I went away from Springfield when the Convention was in session, to attend court in Tazewell County.' The Republicans had put his name upon their Committee, but he had refused to attend its meetings, 'and I never had anything to do with that organization.'

Lincoln did not then make answer to the questions which Douglas had put to him. He did so at the next debate, however, as we shall see, and asked counter questions. This delay was typical of Lincoln's slow and sure-footed methods.

In reply to Douglas's charge of abolitionism, Lincoln read long extracts from his Peoria speech of 1854.

'Put on your specs,' cried a man in the crowd.

'Yes, sir, I am obliged to do so; I am no longer a young man,' responded Lincoln, and the crowd laughed.

That, insisted Lincoln, was all that he ever had said about slavery and 'the black race;' and to argue from that, that he therefore believed in negro equality, was 'but a specious and fantastic arrangement of words, by which a man can prove a horse-chestnut to be a chestnut horse. [Laughter.]' He was as much for white supremacy as Douglas was, whenever the necessity of choice arose.

'There is a physical difference between the two [races] which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together on the footing of perfect equality.' But that was no reason for denying the negro the natural rights stated in the Declaration. '[Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. . . . He is not my equal in many respects. . . . But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal, and the

equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. [Great applause.]'

Douglas was mistaken about Lincoln's having been a grocery-keeper. '[Laughter]'; but 'I don't know as it would be a great sin, if I had been. . . . Lincoln never kept a grocery anywhere in the world. [Laughter.] It is true that Lincoln did work the latter part of one winter in a little still-house, up at the head of a hollow. [Roars of laughter.]' [1]

As to the Mexican War: 'You remember I was an old Whig, and whenever the Democratic party tried to get me to vote that the war had been righteously begun by the President, I would not do it. But whenever they asked for any money, or land-warrants, or anything to pay the soldiers there, . . . I gave the same vote that Judge Douglas did. [Loud applause.]' [2]

Thereafter Lincoln's speech, like that of Douglas, was a repetition of former ones. As to his house-divided speech: 'I had no thought in the world that I was doing anything to bring about a war between the Free and Slave States.' Lincoln had a great deal to say about Douglas having called him 'a kind, amiable, and intelligent gentleman,' always bringing roars of laughter from the crowd. He went over, at much length, the charge of conspiracy to extend slavery over the country and asked Douglas if he had not said outright, that the charge was a falsehood.

'The Judge nods to me that it is so. . . . I know the Judge is a great man, while I am only a small man, but *I feel that I have got him.* [Tremendous cheering.] . . . If the evidence proves the existence of the conspiracy, does his broad answer denying all knowledge, information, or belief, disturb that fact? It can only show that he was used by conspirators, and was not a leader of them. [Vociferous cheering.] . . . I do not say that I *know* such a conspiracy to exist,' but '*I believe it.*'

Here Lincoln made a point more important than all the rest of his speech together; for it led directly to the famous question which he put to Douglas at Freeport six days later. As we have seen, the Administration organ at Washington had attacked Douglas violently for opposing the Lecompton Constitution,

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 102. [2] *Ib.*, 103. See Vol. II, Chaps. II and III.

had read him out of the Democratic Party, had called him a renegade, a deserter, a traitor. When closing the Lecompton debate in the Senate, Douglas had struck back at the paper, quoting from a long editorial in it that State laws prohibiting slavery were unconstitutional, and denouncing that statement, made in connection with the Lecompton Constitution, as 'a *fatal blow* to the sovereignty of the States.' [1]

Lincoln read that part of Douglas's Senate speech, and said that it was the very same charge against the Administration which Lincoln had made against Douglas, 'that he thinks I am so corrupt for uttering.' We must bear in mind that the Administration organ was continuing to assail Douglas as fiercely as ever and that Administration Democrats in Illinois were doing the same thing. Nothing could have been devised better calculated to keep open the Democratic split than this manœuvre of Lincoln, while at the same time it confounded the retort of Douglas at Clinton to Lincoln's conspiracy charge: 'I did not suppose there was a man in America with a heart so corrupt as to believe such a charge could be true. I have too much respect for Mr. Lincoln to suppose he is serious in making the charge.' Yet Douglas had done the same thing himself in the Senate. Serious! Did Douglas think that Lincoln was making so grave a charge 'in fun? [Laughter.]'

In view of Douglas's own conduct, let him say 'how corrupt a man's heart must be to make such a charge! [Vociferous cheering.]' [2] Presently, at Freeport, we shall hear Lincoln follow up his advantage.

There was no danger of war between the States over slavery, asserted Lincoln. Douglas was helping to prepare the people for the nationalization of slavery, by upholding the first Dred Scott decision as a 'Thus saith the Lord' in order that the people would accept the second decision in the same spirit. 'It needs only the formality of the second Dred Scott decision, which he endorses in advance, to make slavery alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.' [3] Lincoln's peroration was a paraphrase of Clay's speech as president

[1] *Cong. Globe*, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, 199–200.

[2] *Debates:* Sparks, 110–3. Italics Lincoln's. [3] *Ib.*, 113–6.

of the National Colonization Society delivered almost a decade before the Abolition assault began; Douglas was now doing all that Clay — 'my *beau ideal* of a statesman, the man for whom I fought all my humble life' — had then condemned.[1] Lincoln stopped a quarter of an hour before his time was up.

Amid much confusion and angry interruptions Douglas began his rejoinder. He recalled the scene in the State House at Springfield in October, 1854, when Ichabod Codding had come in at the close of Lincoln's speech and asked all Republicans to go over to their convention in the Senate Chamber. At this point exclamations came from the crowd until the Chairman of the Republican Committee rebuked his fellow partisans.[2] Lincoln, too, broke in on Douglas in an angry and excited manner, reported all but the Republican press.[3] Lincoln had never denied, said Douglas, that the Republican resolutions just read, expressed his sentiments, although 'this has been published on Mr. Lincoln over and over again. [Three cheers.]'

Lincoln's denial that he acted on the Republican Committee was 'a miserable quibble to avoid this main issue,' cried Douglas. See how he had dodged the questions. Was he for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law? Not on the Committee. If elected to the Senate, would he vote against the admission of a slave State? Not on the Committee — up in Tazewell County. Would he vote to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia? No answer. Would he vote against acquiring territory unless slavery were excluded from it? No answer. 'He knows I will trot him down to Egypt. [Laughter and cheers.] I intend to make him answer there, ["That's right"] or I will show the

[1] 'Henry Clay once said of a class of men who would repress all tendencies to liberty and ultimate emancipation, that they must, if they would do this, go back to the era of our Independence, and muzzle the cannon which thunders its annual joyous return; they must blow out the moral lights around us; they must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate there the love of liberty; and then, and not till then, could they perpetuate slavery in this country! [Loud cheers.]' *Debates:* Sparks, 116.

[2] 'I hope no Republican will interrupt Mr. Douglas. The masses listened to Mr. Lincoln attentively, and, as respectable men, we ought now to hear Mr. Douglas, and without interruption.' *Ib.*, 117.

[3] 'Two of the Republican committee here seized Mr. Lincoln, and by a sudden jerk caused him to disappear from the front of the stand, one of them saying quite audibly, "What are you making such a fuss for? Douglas didn't interrupt you, and can't you see that the people don't like it?"' *Ib.*, 118.

people of Illinois that he does not intend to answer these questions.' [1]

From the crowd a Republican cried: 'How about the conspiracy?'

But, for a moment more, Douglas drove home Lincoln's refusal to answer the questions put to him — basic questions now up for discussion and settlement, insisted Douglas. 'Without an excuse for refusing to answer these questions, he sat down long before his time was out. [Cheers.]'

Douglas had paid no attention to Lincoln's 'playful' figure of speech about Stephen, James, Franklin, and Roger, he said, because he did not object to Lincoln's throwing his arguments together in any style he liked; but when he said that he intended, in that way, to charge corruption and conspiracy against Douglas, the Supreme Court, and two Presidents of the United States, Lincoln became offensive. How, now, did Lincoln evade responsibility for so terrible an accusation? By declaring that although he did not know the charge to be true, still since Douglas had not denied it, he would charge the conspiracy as a fact, and thus Lincoln had accused Douglas of 'moral turpitude.' In order that Lincoln should have no excuse for doing so again on the ground that Douglas had been silent, Douglas branded it 'in all its bearings, an infamous lie. ["Three cheers for Douglas."]'

Amid almost continuous cheering and laughter, Douglas repeated his denial of the conspiracy charge: 'I know it to be false, and nobody else knows it to be true. . . . I will say that it is a lie, and let him prove it if he can. . . . Mr. Lincoln has not character enough for integrity and truth, merely on his own *ipse dixit*, to arraign President Buchanan, President Pierce, and nine Judges of the Supreme Court, not one of whom would be complimented by being put on an equality with him. ["Hit him again," "three cheers," etc.]' [2]

Explaining the reasons for voting down the Chase amendment, and for including the word 'State' in the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Douglas swung into an attack on Lincoln's house-divided doctrine which, insisted Douglas, 'will inevitably bring

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 118–20. [2] *Ib.*, 121–2.

about a dissolution of the Union,' but stopped when told that his time was up.

So came to an end the first of the debates. Here, for the last time, we must make note of the opposite accounts of the partisan press on both sides. According to the Republican papers, Douglas, discomfited and crushed, left the stand, his followers chagrined at his defeat; while Lincoln was borne away in triumph on the shoulders of stalwart young Republican farmers, surrounded by exulting thousands. The Douglas papers declared that their hero left the stand amid the prodigious enthusiasm of the multitude which, cheering wildly, followed him to the hotel; while Lincoln, the picture of despair, stood quaking on the platform until some sturdy Republicans took him on their shoulders 'and preceded by a band, and surrounded by a lonesome squad of fifty or a hundred, tailed in after the mass of people,' who had gone with Douglas. 'This funereal escort passes through the crowd and bore Mr. Lincoln to his quarters, . . . with his long arms about his carriers' shoulders, his long legs dangling nearly to the ground.'[1]

In such a spirit the fight raged on. It soon became more heated and theatrical than any political contest ever waged in the country. In comparison, the frenzied campaign for Frémont was pallid and calm. Trumbull, Lincoln, Lovejoy, Washburne, and Republican speakers of lesser note assailed Douglas from every stump. The negro orator, Frederick Douglass, came to Illinois and joined in the assault. The Administration Democrats grew more active and vicious. The Republican papers, in flaming headlines and blazing articles and editorials, denounced the resolutions read by Douglas at Ottawa, as a forgery; they had been adopted at Aurora, not at Springfield. Douglas knew that they were fraudulent when he read them. Indeed, he and his man Friday, Lanphier, had conspired to put them in the Democratic organ in Springfield in 1854 — therefore Douglas himself was a forger. '*Forgery!*' screamed the Republican press. '*Forgery!*' shouted the Republican stump speakers.

Exasperated and doubtful, but showing no sign of irritation or fear, Douglas wired Usher F. Linder of Charleston: 'The hell-

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 124–45.

hounds are on my track. For God's sake, Linder, come and help me fight them.' The operator sold a copy of the telegram to the Republicans who published it. Anti-Douglas men rocked with laughter. They had him — the Little Giant was done for! And poor Linder! Thereafter as long as he lived, he was called 'For-God's-sake-Linder.'

But not all the friends of Lincoln were pleased with his conduct at Ottawa. Parker thought his evasions of Douglas's questions unmanly. 'Mr. Lincoln did not meet the issue,' the Boston preacher wrote to Herndon; 'he made a technical evasion; "he had nothing to do with the resolutions in question." Suppose he had not, admit they were forged. Still they were the vital questions pertinent to the issue, and Lincoln dodged them. That is not the way to fight the battle of freedom.' [1]

Before the second debate, held at Freeport, Lincoln spoke in Henry, Augusta, and Macomb. At the last place his speech was 'conversational rather than formal . . . especially effective.' Next morning, August 26, he rambled about the little town, and had his picture taken at a small daguerreotype gallery. This is the famous Macomb ambrotype, and because it was not leaded or touched up, is undoubtedly the best likeness of Lincoln as he looked at that time. In the afternoon, he took the train for Amboy, making a short speech and remaining there for the night.[2]

During the six days between the Ottawa and Freeport debates Lincoln had prepared answers to the questions which Douglas had put to him; and he had decided to ask counter questions on which he had been thinking for several weeks. One of these questions — the second in order — and Douglas's answer to it were to be made historic by later events. That question was:

'Can the people of a United States Territory, in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution?' [3]

[1] Parker to Herndon, Boston, Sept. 9, 1858. Newton, 208.

[2] White, in Herndon and Weik, II, 109, mentions, on hearsay, a conference held at Dixon, on Aug. 26, between Lincoln and some Chicago supporters; but the fact that Lincoln passed that night at Amboy is against such a conference, and White doubtless had in mind the talk with Medill and others on the train the following day.

[3] *Debates:* Sparks, 152.

On the train to Freeport Lincoln handed his questions to Joseph Medill, who had joined him somewhere on the road, asking his newspaper friend what he thought of them, a usual practice of political speakers who are also candidates, then and to this day. Medill objected to the second question; it would let Douglas out of the tight place he was in on the slavery question. Lincoln was obdurate. He intended 'to spear it at Douglas that afternoon,' he said. The Republican candidate for Congress from that District, Elihu B. Washburne, and the Republican State Chairman, Norman B. Judd, had come to Freeport for the big meeting. When Lincoln and Medill arrived, Medill told them about Lincoln's purpose. Both were worried, went to Lincoln's room where he was washing his hands and face, and tried to get him to drop, or at least to change, the question. Lincoln would not yield. Other Republican leaders protested in vain.[1]

In the campaign biographies of Lincoln, written two years later, in the heat and flurry of the presidential contest, and when he was the Republican candidate for President, the story first appeared that Lincoln and other party leaders held a grave conference over the question and, when told that it and the reply Douglas was sure to make, would lose Lincoln the Senatorship, Lincoln said: 'I am after bigger game. The battle of 1860 is worth a hundred of this.' No evidence has yet been discovered that anything of the kind took place. Nor was there reason for such a momentous discussion, and especially none for the exercise by Lincoln of that superhuman foresight attributed to him.

Everybody knew what answer Douglas would make. Lincoln himself had heard his antagonist say in two speeches that without friendly legislation slavery could not exist in the Territories or anywhere else,[2] and Lincoln had read other speeches of Douglas in which he had said the same thing.[3]

[1] Medill's statement, *Chicago Tribune*, May 9, 1895, in *Debates:* Sparks, 203–6.

[2] Douglas's Springfield speech, June 12, 1857, and his Bloomington speech, July 16, 1858.

[3] Douglas's Springfield speech, July 17, 1858, and his Senate speech in 1850, in which he had expounded at length the same doctrine. As has been seen, James L. Orr of South Carolina, now Speaker of the House, and other Southern leaders, had stated the fact in stronger terms than Douglas ever made use of, that local legislation was indispensable to slavery; only a few days before the Freeport debate, Jefferson Davis, in a much talked of speech at Portland, Maine, had made identical assertions, but Davis claimed the

The South was already beginning to move against the idea that local laws could exclude slavery from the 'common territory' of the Nation, the extremist press of the South was spurring that movement on, and, most important of all in its effect on the Democratic split in Illinois, the national organ of the Administration took the same view.

So there was an excellent reason, applicable to the campaign then raging in Illinois, for Lincoln to put this question to Douglas at that particular moment. In doing so Lincoln showed common sense and political skill. That practical and immediate reason Lincoln himself gave at the time. The most striking feature of the Illinois contest was the split in the Democratic Party. It was Douglas's chief danger, Lincoln's chief hope, and both men knew it. Earnest efforts had been made and were then being made by Douglas, his lieutenants, and by party leaders from other States, to close the breach in the Democratic ranks. The plain Republican policy was to keep that breach open, and, if possible, widen it.

Lincoln, then, did not ask his celebrated Freeport question merely to hurt Douglas in the South. It was not his own idea; he had been pondering over it a long time. As soon as it was known that the debates would take place, Henry Asbury, a lawyer of Quincy and an ardent Republican, had urged Lincoln to ask Douglas this very question, in various forms; and on the same day that he closed the arrangement for the contest, Lincoln had written to Asbury about the question and the answer which Douglas surely would make to it:

SPRINGFIELD, *July* 31, 1858.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of the 28th is received. The points you propose to press upon Douglas he will be very hard to get up to, but I think you labor under a mistake when you say no one cares how he answers. This implies that it is equal with him whether he is injured here or at the South. That is a mistake. He cares nothing for the South; he knows he is already dead there. He only leans Southerward more to keep the Buchanan

extracts taken did not fully represent his views. *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist:* Dunbar Rowland, III, 344–6.

party from growing in Illinois. You shall have hard work to get him directly to the point whether a territorial legislature has or has not the power to exclude slavery. But if you succeed in bringing him to it — though he will be compelled to say it possesses no such power — he will instantly take ground that slavery cannot actually exist in the Territories unless the people desire it, and so give it protection by territorial legislation. If this offends the South, he will let it offend them, as at all events he means to hold on to his chances in Illinois. You will soon learn by the papers that both the judge and myself are to be in Quincy on the 13th of October, when and where I expect the pleasure of seeing you. Yours very truly,

A. LINCOLN.[1]

Such then was Lincoln's view at the time. Douglas's purpose was to 'keep the Buchanan party from growing in Illinois,' and that purpose must be overcome. Nothing could do that so well as to put Douglas once more into conspicuous antagonism to the growing Southern tendency with which the President was in sympathy. So, at last, Lincoln decided to include Asbury's question with those he had himself devised for the same end — to keep open the democratic split. It was good political strategy, and in keeping with Lincoln's practical mind which always was intent on the task immediately before him, whatever that task might be. Even more characteristic of Lincoln was the long delay in making up his mind and his unmistakable firmness when that was done.

Again we are fortunate in having a clear and obviously impartial and accurate account by one who was there, of how Lincoln and Douglas looked in this campaign. Ingalls Carleton, a Lincoln man, thus describes them as he saw them at Freeport:

'Lincoln was tall and ungainly with a lean face, homely and sorrowful looking, while Douglas was short and fat, easy in manner and his full face appeared to be that of a man whose life had been one of success and sunshine.

'Douglas was dressed in what might have been called plantation style. He was richly dressed. He wore a ruffled shirt much

[1] *Works*, III, 197–8.

in style in wealthy and aristocratic circles those days, a dark blue coat buttoned close with shiny buttons, light trousers and shiny shoes, with a wide brimmed soft hat like the prosperous politicians of the southern part of Illinois wear to this day [1908]. He made a picture fitted for the stage.

'Lincoln wore that old high stovepipe hat with a coarse looking coat with sleeves far too short, and baggy looking trousers that were so short that they showed his rough boots. The Douglas men laughed at him and said he would be a nice looking object to put in the senate and to tell the truth the Lincoln men couldn't brag much on their man for exhibition purposes.' [1] Before the debate, Lincoln and Douglas, in response to calls from the crowd before the hotel, came out on the balcony, arm in arm, and bowed several times.[2]

The speakers' stand was only a block or two from the hotel. Lincoln got into a big Conestoga farm wagon, filled with farmers, and rode, while the multitude cheered this symbolism of his kinship with the common man. When Douglas saw Lincoln in the lumbering old farm wagon, he decided to go the short distance on foot. The platform was low and small, with hardly room upon it for the speakers and reporters. The weather was chill and damp, but the crowd was even bigger than that at Ottawa, fully fifteen thousand having come to see the fight. They were overwhelmingly Republican, of strong Abolition tendencies and bellicose in feeling and spirit.

Lincoln opened the debate. He first made answer to the questions which Douglas had asked him at Ottawa, and he did it in a curious way, thoroughly characteristic of his cautious and precise nature. He repeated the exact words of each of Douglas's questions, and then, except for the sixth question, again restating Douglas's exact words, said in each of his answers, that he was not '*pledged*' to do what Douglas had asked him. Having taken some time in this fashion, Lincoln put his answers in direct form.

[1] Carleton's statement in *Debates:* Sparks, 206–7.

[2] *Ib.* 'I must say that Douglas made the most graceful bow. It seemed natural for him to bow. Lincoln bowed awkwardly and appeared to be more awkward in comparison with the gracefulness and ease of Douglas. Douglas accepted the plaudits of the people as one who felt that they belonged to him or at least that was the way it seemed.'

Under the Constitution, said Lincoln, 'the Southern States are entitled to a Fugitive-Slave Law.' So he had nothing to say about the existing law except that, 'without lessening its efficiency,' it should have been framed so as 'to be free from some of the objections to it.' But why talk about it, since the amendment or repeal of that law was not being urged now? 'I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery.'

As to the admission of more slave States, Lincoln said that he 'would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question;' he would be 'exceedingly glad' if none were ever brought into the Union '[Applause]'; but if slavery was kept out of a Territory until it was ready and applied for statehood, then if, in that situation, the people should 'do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave constitution, . . . I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union. [Applause.]' [1]

He would also be 'exceedingly glad' to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia, said Lincoln, to cries of 'Good!' 'Good!' from the crowd. 'Yet as a member of Congress, I should not, with my present views, be in favor of *endeavoring* to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: *First*, that the abolition should be gradual; *second*, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District; and *third*, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions, I confess that I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay, "sweep from our capital that foul blot upon our nation." [Loud applause.]'

These were precisely the ideas expressed in Lincoln's proposed slavery bill when in Congress, and the restatement of them ten years later well illustrates the tenacity with which he held to a thought or plan.

Lincoln would not commit himself on the abolition of the slave trade between different States. 'I am *pledged* to nothing about it,' he insisted. 'It is a subject to which I have not given

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 150.

that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the constitutional power to do it.' But even if he thought that Congress did have that power, he should still not be in favor of its exercise 'unless upon some conservative principle as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.' [1]

Of course he was for the exclusion of slavery from all the Territories wherever situated; it was 'the *right* and *duty* of Congress' to prohibit it, he had said in his formal, written replies to Douglas's questions. As to new territory: 'I am not generally opposed to the honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate the slavery question among ourselves. [Cries of "Good! good!"]'

There, said Lincoln, were his views and he would stand by them everywhere. If there was a place in the State where those opinions would make him enemies, it was right there in Freeport, he declared.[2]

Then Lincoln asked Douglas his counter questions: Would Douglas vote to admit Kansas if its people should adopt a State Constitution before they were as numerous as required by the English bill? Could the people of a Territory lawfully exclude slavery before they formed a State Constitution? If the Supreme Court should 'decree' that the States themselves could not exclude slavery, would Douglas favor acquiescence in such a decision 'as a rule of political action?' Was Douglas for the acquisition of a new Territory regardless of how it might 'affect the nation on the slavery question?' Applause came increasingly to these questions as Lincoln read them.[3]

Amid bursts of laughter, cheering, and shouts of pure glee from the delighted crowds, Lincoln with great skill attacked Douglas for having said at Ottawa that the resolutions he read were those of the Springfield Convention of 1854 when, in fact,

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 151. [2] *Ib.*, 149, 151–2. [3] *Ib.*, 152.

they were those of a Convention in Kane County, and when Lincoln had no more to do with either than if they had been 'passed in the moon.' Yet Douglas, twelve years a Senator, and not an ordinary Senator, but one with a name of 'world-wide renown,' had made an assertion 'which the slightest investigation would have shown him to be wholly false.' Lincoln could account for it only on the ground that Douglas's evil genius had at last deserted him — that evil genius which had so favored Douglas all his life, 'as to lead very many good men to doubt there being any advantage in virtue over vice.' The crowd laughed and cheered, and cheered and laughed again and again.[1]

And this was the man who charged that Trumbull and Lincoln were guilty of falsehood. Could Douglas find in anything that Trumbull or Lincoln had said, 'a justification at all compared with what we have, in this instance, for that sort of vulgarity. [Cries of "Good! Good!"]'

The remainder of Lincoln's opening was devoted to his favorite charge that Douglas and the Democrats had voted down the Chase amendment to 'leave room' for the Dred Scott decision.[2] Douglas had inveighed at 'the enormity of Lincoln — an insignificant individual like Lincoln' — in having 'upon his *ipse dixit*' charged conspiracy on two Presidents, the Supreme Court, and a majority of Congress; but, said Lincoln, he had made no charge on his '*ipse dixit*'; he had only 'arrayed the evidence tending to prove it.' But Douglas himself had made the same charge against the Administration and his fellow Democrats for supporting the Lecompton Constitution. Having occupied his full time, Lincoln stopped.

He was glad, began Douglas, that, at last, Lincoln had decided to answer the questions put to him at Ottawa — he had shown no disposition to do so at that place. Those questions were based upon the Republican platform, whereas the questions which Lincoln had just put to Douglas had never 'received the sanction of the party with which I am acting,' but came solely from Lincoln's 'curiosity. ["That's a fact."]'

Why did not Lincoln say what *he* would do about admitting

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 152–4. [2] *Ib.*, 155–8.

Kansas with insufficient population, before asking what Douglas would do in such a case? For Trumbull, who was supporting Lincoln, had voted against admitting Oregon during the whole of the last session of Congress on that very ground. Was Lincoln fighting Trumbull on that issue? '["Good, put it to him," and cheers.]'

But he would answer, said Douglas, and he made the statement to which we have listened so often, that 'as she [Kansas] has population enough to constitute a Slave State, she has people enough for a Free State. [Cheers.]'

Then Douglas made his celebrated reply to Lincoln's second question: 'I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times from every stump in Illinois,[1] that in my opinion the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution. [Enthusiastic applause.] Mr. Lincoln knew that I had answered that question over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska bill on that principle all over the State in 1854, in 1855, and in 1856, and he has no excuse for pretending to be in doubt as to my position on that question.

'It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a Territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere, unless it is supported by local police regulations. ["Right, right."]

'Those police regulations can only be established by the local legislature; and if the people are opposed to slavery, they will elect representatives to that body who will by unfriendly legislation effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a Slave Territory or a Free Territory is perfect

[1] This was the campaigner's usual exaggeration. While Lincoln may have heard Douglas state his friendly legislation doctrine often, it is only known positively that he heard it twice and read it twice.

and complete under the Nebraska bill. I hope Mr. Lincoln deems my answer satisfactory on that point.' [1]

So once more Lincoln had drawn Douglas into a renewal of his warfare with the Administration — once more he had caused Douglas to open the old wounds.

Douglas was 'amazed' he said, that Lincoln should ask his third question — whether, if the Supreme Court should decide that a *State* could not exclude slavery from its own limits, Douglas would 'submit to it.' An auditor exclaimed: 'A schoolboy knows better.' Yes, said Douglas, 'a schoolboy does know better.' Lincoln knew that there was only one man in America 'claiming any degree of intelligence or decency, who ever for a moment pretended such a thing.' That man was the editor of the *Washington Union*, Douglas stated; and when he had said so, in his paper, Douglas had promptly denounced it in the Senate, while 'Lincoln's friends, Trumbull, and Seward, and Hale, and Wilson, and the whole Black Republican side of the Senate, were silent. They left it to me to denounce it. [Cheers.]'

Toombs of Georgia had rebuked Douglas at the time, he said, because the *Union* editorial was not worthy of notice; and Toombs had declared 'that there was not one man, woman, or child south of the Potomac, in any Slave State, who did not repudiate any such pretension. Mr. Lincoln knows that that reply was made on the spot, and yet now he asks this question.'

The question was unthinkable! Lincoln 'might as well ask me, Suppose Mr. Lincoln should steal a horse, would I sanction it, [Laughter] and it would be as genteel in me to ask him, in the event he stole a horse, what ought to be done with him. He casts an imputation upon the Supreme Court of the United States, by supposing that they would violate the Constitution of the United States. I tell him that such a thing is not possible. [Cheers.] It would be an act of moral treason that no man on the bench could ever descend to. Mr. Lincoln himself would never [even] in his partisan feelings so far forget what was right as to be guilty of such an act. ["Good, good."]' [2]

Lincoln's question about acquiring new territory was 'very ingeniously and cunningly put,' said Douglas. ['Now we've got

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 161–2. [2] *Ib.*, 163–4.

him,' Deacon Bross, then one of the owners of the *Chicago Press and Tribune*, remarked in a low voice.] Was Lincoln himself opposed to it 'under any circumstance?' The 'Black Republican creed' expressly made that pledge — did Lincoln stand by that pledge? Instead of answering directly and simply, Lincoln, 'Yankee-fashion,' asks Douglas the same question in a different form. But Douglas would not thus dodge, he said: 'I answer that whenever it becomes necessary, in our growth and progress, to acquire more territory, that I am in favor of it, without reference to the question of slavery; and when we have acquired it, I will leave the people free to do as they please, either to make it slave or free territory as they prefer. [Here Deacon Bross spoke; the reporter believes that he said, "That's bold." It was said solemnly.]' [1] Then Douglas launched into his favorite appeal for territorial expansion, an argument and a prophecy that time and events have strangely fulfilled.

Had Lincoln more questions? 'As soon as he is able to hold a council with his advisers, Lovejoy, Farnsworth, and Fred Douglass, he will frame and propound others. ["Good, good." Renewed laughter, in which Mr. Lincoln feebly joined, saying that he hoped with their aid to get seven questions, the number asked him by Judge Douglas, and so make *conclusions* even.]' [2]

When Douglas again uttered the words 'You Black Republicans,' protests came from the crowd — 'White, white,' some yelled. Like a flash, Douglas seized the incident as an excuse to make his negro equality plea; and in dramatic fashion he did it. 'I have reason to recollect that some people in this country think that Fred Douglass is a very good man. The last time I came here to make a speech, while talking from the stand to you, people of Freeport, as I am doing to-day, I saw a carriage — a magnificent one it was — drive up and take a position on the outside of the crowd; a beautiful young lady was sitting on the box-seat, whilst Fred Douglass and her mother reclined inside, and the owner of the carriage acted as driver. [Laughter, cheers, cries of "right," "what have you to say against it," etc.] I saw this in your own town. ["What of it?"]

'All I have to say of it is this, that if you, Black Republicans

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 164. [2] *Ib.*, 165.

think that the negro ought to be on a social equality with your wives and daughters, and ride in a carriage with your wife, whilst you drive the team, you have a perfect right to do so. ["Good, good," and cheers, mingled with hooting and cries of "white, white."]

'I am told that one of Fred Douglass's kinsmen, another rich black negro, is now traveling in this part of the State, making speeches for his friend Lincoln as champion of black men. ["White men, white men," and "What have you to say against it?" "That's right," etc.] All I have to say on that subject is, that those of you who believe that the negro is your equal and ought to be on an equality with you socially, politically, and legally, have a right to entertain those opinions, and of course will vote for Mr. Lincoln. ["Down with the negro," "no, no," etc.]'[1]

At great length, Douglas went into the mistake made by him at Ottawa about the place where the Republican resolutions read by him had been adopted. He told how the error came to be made, and said that he did not then know differently, nor did Lincoln, who had not denied at the time that the resolutions were those of the Springfield Convention 'and evidently thought that they were; . . . but not a word is said about his ignorance on the subject, whilst I, notwithstanding the circumstances, am accused of forgery.'

The Republican excuse for that, said Douglas, was that the resolutions had not been adopted on the '"*right spot.*" [Laughter and applause.] Lincoln and his political friends are great on "*spots.*" [Renewed laughter.] In Congress, as a representative of this State, he declared the Mexican war to be unjust and infamous, and would not support it, or acknowledge his own country to be right in the contest, because he said that American blood was not shed on American soil in the "*right spot.*" ["Lay on to him."] And now he cannot answer the questions I put to him at Ottawa because the resolutions I read were not adopted on the "*right spot.*"'[2]

What quibbling! What a trivial excuse for evading the real issue! For, contended Douglas, those very resolutions had been adopted in nearly all the Northern counties and Congressional

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 165–6. [2] *Ib.*, 166–8.

Districts that gave Republican majorities in the election that year, and that were depended upon to give Lincoln his majorities at the election this year. Amid a tumult of shouting, laughter, cheers, and hostile and friendly cries, Douglas read and made comment upon resolutions adopted by the Rockford Republican Convention of 1854 at which Washburne had been nominated for Congress from that very District — the Freeport District. They were almost identical with the Aurora resolutions. 'When I get into the next district, I will show that the same platform was adopted there, and so on through the State, until I nail the responsibility of it upon the back of the Black Republican party throughout the State. ["White, white," "three cheers for Douglas."]

'*A Voice:* Couldn't you modify it, and call it brown? [Laughter.]'

Thomas J. Turner, Speaker of the House when Trumbull beat Lincoln for the Senate — Tom Turner, a Democratic renegade, Douglas had just called him — who was now one of the moderators of the Freeport meeting and was on the platform, spoke up and said that he had drawn the Rockford resolutions. '[Hurrah for Turner: Hurrah for Douglas.]' Then he would not deny that they were the Republican creed, cried Douglas.

'*Mr. Turner.* — "They are our creed exactly." [Cheers.]

'*Mr. Douglas.* — And yet Lincoln denies that he stands on them. ["Good, good," and laughter.]'

Again Douglas recounted the Democratic version of the Lincoln-Trumbull deal for the Senate, Trumbull's defeat of Lincoln by 'cheating' him, the anger of Lincoln and his friends and, 'to keep them quiet,' the pledge that Lincoln should have the Senatorship next time: 'Lincoln could not be silenced in any other way.'

Many of 'you Black Republicans' did not know about that, exclaimed Douglas. '["White, white," and great clamor.] I wish to remind you that while Mr. Lincoln was speaking there was not a Democrat vulgar and blackguard enough to interrupt him. [Great applause and cries of, "Hurrah for Douglas."] . . . I have seen your mobs before, and defy your wrath. [Tremendous applause.]'

Douglas read the Republican resolutions offered by Lovejoy in the Legislature the day before Trumbull was elected to the Senate. They, too, contained the same propositions that were in the Aurora resolutions, and, cried Douglas triumphantly, every man but two who had voted for those Lovejoy resolutions had also voted for Lincoln for Senator on the very next day. Let Turner, 'who stands by me,' and who was pledged to vote for no man for Senator unless he was committed to that 'Black Republican platform [Cries of "White, white," and "Good for you."]' — let Turner testify.

'I now ask Mr. Turner [turning to Mr. Turner], did you violate your pledge in voting for Mr. Lincoln, or did he commit himself to your platform before you cast your vote for him? [Mr. Lincoln here started forward and grasping Mr. Turner, shook him nervously and said "Don't answer, Turner, you have no right to answer."]' [1] Turner did not answer.

Douglas made much fun of the vagueness and qualifications of Lincoln's answers to the questions Douglas had put to him: 'Why can he not speak out, and say what he is for, and what he will do? [Cries of "That's right."]' Although Lincoln thought that the admission of more slave States would dissolve the Union, yet he would not say that he would vote against bringing another slave State into the Union, declared Douglas. 'I ask you if that is fair dealing? . . . Show me that it is my duty in order to save the Union, to do a particular act, and I will do it if the Constitution does not prohibit it,' cried Douglas; thus stating the exact course which Lincoln took to achieve that end during the war. 'I am not for the dissolution of the Union under any circumstances.' But Lincoln said that 'this Union cannot continue to endure with Slave States in it,' and still would not say what he would do about admitting more of them!

'I will retire in shame from the Senate of the United States when I am not willing to be put to the test in the performance of my duty. I have been put to severe tests. ["That is so."] I have stood by my principles in fair weather and in foul. . . . I have defended the great principles of self-government here among you when Northern sentiment ran in a torrent against

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 171–6.

me, [A voice, "That is so."] and I have defended that same great principle when Southern sentiment came down like an avalanche upon me. I was not afraid of any test they put to me. . . . [Cries of "Good," cheers and laughter.]' [1]

Suppose he did charge the Administration organ with corruption, 'when it was true,' did that justify Lincoln in charging two Presidents, the Supreme Court, and others with corruption, when it was false? asked Douglas. Lincoln's conspiracy charge was 'historically false' and he knew it, Douglas went on. Buchanan was in London as Minister to Great Britain before, during, and after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, so he could not have been in Lincoln's imaginary conspiracy; the Dred Scott case was not even on the docket of the Supreme Court when that legislation was enacted, so the members of that tribunal could not have been among Lincoln's mysterious conspirators; 'as to President Pierce, his high character as a man of integrity and honor is enough to vindicate him from such a charge; [laughter and applause] and as to myself, I pronounce the charge an infamous lie, whenever and wherever made, by whomsoever made. I am willing that Mr. Lincoln should go and rake up every public act of mine, . . . speech delivered . . . and criticise them; but when he charges upon me a corrupt conspiracy for the purpose of perverting the institutions of the country, I brand it as it deserves.'

Why this attempt to make it appear now that Douglas was still at war with Buchanan? 'When I differed with the President, I spoke out so that you all heard me. ["That you did," and cheers.]' He would do it again if need be, shouted Douglas. But that question had 'passed away,' and the President had said in his message that, hereafter, all State Constitutions ought to be submitted to the people. 'I know Mr. Lincoln's object: he wants to divide the Democratic party, in order that he may defeat me and get to the Senate.' Told here, that his time was up, Douglas 'stopped on the moment.' [2]

The sporting blood of his supporters now eager and hot, Lincoln was greeted with 'vociferous cheers,' when he arose. If the crowd showed no 'vulgarity and blackguardism' when he was

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 177–9. [2] *Ib.*, 180–1.

speaking, said Lincoln, *he* had used no 'vulgarity and blackguardism' when they were listening. '[Laughter and applause.]' The Republican resolutions of 1854 that Douglas had cited or read, were 'local, and did not spread over the whole State,' and therefore did not represent nor bind the entire party, as such. 'We at last met together in 1856, from all parts of the State, and we agreed upon a common platform.' If anything was then yielded it was for 'practical purposes,' in order that all might unite against measures which all opposed. So all Republicans were bound, 'as a party, *to that platform.*'

If Douglas could find one member of the Legislature who voted for Lincoln in 1855 and was 'determined to have pledges from me: . . . who will tell him anything inconsistent with what I say now, I will resign, or rather retire from the race, and give him no more trouble,' exclaimed Lincoln, and the crowd applauded.

He had made no secret pledges and Douglas need not fear that he would say or do anything in Washington that he did not proclaim on the stump, said Lincoln amid laughter. 'I'll tell you what he is afraid of. *He is afraid we'll all pull together.* [Applause and cries of "We will! We will!"]'[1] He had answered Douglas's questions as fairly as he knew how, insisted Lincoln. The admission of a single slave State would not 'permanently fix the character and establish this as a universal slave nation.'

The remainder of Lincoln's rejoinder was devoted to Douglas's charge against the *Washington Union* — it was really against the President, Lincoln repeated. At that time, Douglas 'had an eye farther north than he has to-day;' but now he was again looking toward the South. '[Laughter and cheers.]' His hope then was to make 'the great "Black Republican" party . . . the tail of his new kite;' but now he was 'crawling back into his old camp,' and he would finally be found in 'full fellowship' with those he then fought, and with whom he now pretended to be at 'such fearful variance. [Loud applause, and cries of "Go on, go on."] I cannot, gentlemen, my time has expired.'[2]

Lincoln had 'TUMBLED DOUGLAS ALL OVER STEPHENSON

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 182–3. Italics Lincoln's. [2] *Ib.*, 185–8.

COUNTY,' said the Republican *Press;*[1] the Freeport contest was a 'SECOND ROUT FOR LINCOLN,' exulted the Douglas papers.[2] Among themselves, the Republican politicians felt badly, while the Douglas men were encouraged. Such were the methods of the two men in debate, such their manner and appearance, such the temper of the crowds, such the utterly contradictory nature of accounts in the partisan press of both sides. In the debates thereafter, a new point was made now and then; but, for the most part, the stump duel became an exhibition of dexterity — bold and quick thrusts, sure and cautious parrying, blows in return to be avoided with skill.

Lincoln kept Herndon busy looking up records, newspaper files, and the like and sending them to the senior partner. On a sleepy September day the rivals met at Jonesboro, Union County, 'an ancient village in the heart of Egypt, among hills and ravines, and invested with forest as the soil itself.'[3] Only twelve or fourteen hundred people were there, nearly all Democrats, a fact that 'evidently embarrassed' Lincoln.[4] Donati's comet was flaming, and, the night before the meeting, Lincoln gazed at it for an hour, as most other people did, too.

In the debate next day [the 15th] Lincoln said that he was bound by the Constitution to let slavery alone in States where it already was, and would do so anyway, 'even if there were no such Constitutional obligation.'[5] He made good use of material sent him by the junior partner. Since Douglas had insisted that Lincoln was bound by resolutions of local Republican Conventions with which Lincoln had had nothing to do, what about similar resolutions adopted by Douglas followers in the past? — and Lincoln read two platforms adopted by Democratic Congressional Conventions in Illinois, an extract from a Democratic newspaper and a set of questions to a Democratic candidate

[1] *Chicago Press and Tribune*, Aug. 30, 1858.

[2] *Illinois State Register*, Sept. 1, 1858.

[3] Chester P. Dewey, special correspondent *New York Evening Post*, Jonesboro, Ill., Sept. 15, in issue Sept. 22, 1858, quoted in *Debates:* Sparks, 261.

[4] *Ib.*, 262. White says Union County was a stronghold of the Buchanan Democrats, and was the cause of a want of enthusiasm for Douglas in the audience. Herndon and Weik, II, 118.

[5] *Debates:* Sparks, 229.

and his answers, all to the same effect as the Republican resolutions which Douglas had read and all in 1850. Was Douglas bound by them?

Douglas made instant answer that, at the time, he had denounced one Democratic candidate as 'no democrat;' and he said that the other would 'have been beat to death' if his 'abolition' answers to the 'abolition questions had been known — they having been published only two days before the election and, even then, in but one county.'

If slave-holders in a Territory should need and ask for Congressional legislation to protect their property, would Douglas vote for it? asked Lincoln in his fifth question to Douglas. To 'immense cheering' Douglas made answer that non-intervention by Congress was 'a fundamental article in the Democratic creed.'[1]

How could Territorial Legislatures pass laws 'unfriendly' to slavery, or even refuse to pass friendly laws, since every member took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and since in the Dred Scott case the Supreme Court had held that the Constitution guaranteed property in slaves? asked Lincoln. Douglas made his old answer that since the Supreme Court had placed its decision on the ground that 'slave property is on an equal footing with other property,' Territorial Legislatures would, of course, treat it like other property — liquor for instance.[2]

At Charleston, September 18, Lincoln was in a county where old line Whigs were thick. Nearly thirty years before, Lincoln with the Hanks-Hall-Lincoln families had gone through the hamlet, and now across the main street the Republicans had stretched an immense banner with a painting of 'Old Abe' as he looked when driving the wagon then. By different routes Lincoln and Douglas came from Mattoon, a little town ten miles distant, each followed by a long procession to which additions were made on the way. The Lincoln procession was led by the 'Bowling Green Band' of Terre Haute, Indiana.[3] More numer-

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 246, 256.

[2] *Ib.*, 242, 258.

[3] *Ib.*, 267.

ous than ever before were banners, mottoes, flags, 'beautiful young ladies dressed in white' on grandly decorated floats. Both sides did all they could to catch the old line Whigs. One Republican legend attracted so much notice that it has found a place in history:

> 'Westward, the star of Empire takes its way,
> The girls *link-on* to Lincoln, as their mothers did to Clay.'[1]

The crowd was even larger than that at Freeport.

Lincoln began his speech by repeating what he had said before on Douglas's issue of negro equality; but he now said it in stronger words and at the very start, and, it must be admitted, he went much farther than he ever had gone. When we read what he said at Charleston, we must have in mind the place where he spoke and the views of most who heard.

'While I was at the hotel to-day,' began Lincoln, 'an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people. [Great laughter.] . . . I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; [applause] that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people. . . .

'And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.'[2]

Lincoln had no fear, he said, that he or his friends would marry negroes, 'if there was no law to keep them from it [laughter];' but since Douglas and his friends did fear 'that they might, if there was no law to keep them from it, [roars of laughter] I give

[1] Charleston Correspondence, *New York Evening Post*, Charleston, Coles Co., Ill., Sept. 18, in issue of Sept. 21, 1858, quoted in *ib.*, 320.

Other versions are, after the first line:

'The Girls *Link-on* to Lincoln — Their mothers were for Clay.' Charleston Correspondence, *Chicago Democrat*, Sept. 18, in issue Sept. 22, 1858, quoted in *ib.*, 317. 'The Girls all link to Lincoln, as their Mothers linked to Clay.' Charleston Correspondence, *Chicago Journal*, Sept. 18, in issue Sept. 20, quoted in *ib.*, 324.

[2] *Debates:* Sparks, 267–8.

him the most solemn pledge that I will to the very last stand by the law of this State, which forbids the marrying of white people with negroes. [Continued laughter and applause.]' [1]

The remainder of Lincoln's speech was on Trumbull's Chicago attack on Douglas, which Trumbull had repeated with increased animosity at Alton, and from which Lincoln read.

So a great deal of Douglas's time was taken up in making answer again to Trumbull's charge. This Douglas did specifically and from the record.[2] 'Why did not he [Trumbull] speak out as boldly in the Senate of the United States, and cram the lie down my throat when I denied the charge, first made by Bigler, and made him take it back? . . . ["He was afraid."]' [3] In beginning his speech, however, Douglas said that he had supposed the purpose of the debates to be to discuss the issues of the day. 'Let me ask you what questions of public policy, relating to the welfare of his State or the Union, has Mr. Lincoln discussed before you?' But, continued Douglas, 'I am glad that I have at last succeeded in getting an answer out of him upon this question of negro citizenship and eligibility to office, for I have been trying to bring him to the point on it ever since this canvass commenced.' [4]

Lincoln's speech was proof, said Douglas, of the plan to divert him from the questions of the campaign. 'He has devoted his entire time to an issue between Mr. Trumbull and myself, and has not uttered a word about the politics of the day.' [5] Lincoln's practice of keeping on making a charge which had been proved to be false, as in the instance of the Trumbull accusation, was shown, said Douglas, in his reiteration of the 'conspiracy' charge with reference to the Dred Scott decision. When Douglas had pointed out that the case was not even on the docket of the Supreme Court until long after the Kansas-Nebraska Act had passed, Lincoln had asserted that 'there was an understanding between the Democratic owners of Dred Scott and the Judges of the Supreme Court and other parties involved, that the case should be brought up. I then demanded to know who these Democratic owners of Dred Scott were. He could not or would not tell; he did not know.'

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 268. [2] *Ib.*, 282–9. [3] *Ib.*, 283–4. [4] *Ib.*, 281. [5] *Ib.*, 286.

Douglas asserted that there were 'no Democratic owners of Dred Scott on the face of the land. [Laughter.] Dred Scott was owned at that time by the Rev. Dr. Chaffee, an Abolition member of Congress from Springfield, Massachusetts, and his wife; [immense laughter and applause] and Mr. Lincoln ought to have known that Dred Scott was so owned, for the reason that as soon as the decision was announced by the Court, Dr. Chaffee and his wife executed a deed emancipating him, and put that deed on record. [Cheers.] It was a matter of public record, therefore, that at the time the case was taken to the Supreme Court, Dred Scott was owned by an Abolition member of Congress, a friend of Lincoln's and a leading man of his party, while the defence was conducted by Abolition lawyers — and thus the Abolitionists managed both sides of the case.

'I have exposed these facts to Mr. Lincoln, and yet he will not withdraw his charge of conspiracy. I now submit to you whether you can place any confidence in a man who continues to make a charge when its utter falsity is proven by the public records.' In view of all these facts, how could he have 'conspired' with men who were not in any conspiracy themselves? asked Douglas. 'I am willing to trust to your knowledge of me and my public conduct without making any more defense against these assaults. [Great cheering.]' [1]

He would make no charges against any candidate, said Douglas, except to repel attacks upon himself. 'If Mr. Lincoln is a man of bad character, I leave you to find it out; if his votes in the past are not satisfactory, I leave others to ascertain the fact; if his course on the Mexican War was not in accordance with your notions of patriotism and fidelity to our own country as against a public enemy, I leave you to ascertain the fact.' [2]

See how shifty 'this great Free-soil Abolition party' was! They would not even call themselves by the same name in different parts of the State. '["They dare not."] . . . What object have these Black Republicans in changing their name in every county? ["To cheat the people."]' In Northern counties, they called themselves Republicans, in the Central counties they dared not use that name but merely called upon all the enemies

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 289–91. [2] *Ib.*, 291.

of the Democracy to unite, while in lower Egypt they adopted the title of the 'Free Democracy.'[1] Now at Charleston, Douglas pressed this point with effect:

'Their principles in the north are jet-black, [laughter], in the center they are in color a decent mulatto, [renewed laughter] and in lower Egypt they are almost white. [Shouts of laughter.]' A house divided against itself cannot stand! Well, look at the Republican Party![2]

As to the American Nation, why could it not stand as the fathers made it and as it had stood and grown great for all those glorious decades since it was founded? asked Douglas and 'stopped on the minute, amidst deafening applause.'[3]

Acclaim as loud and long greeted Lincoln when he got up to close. An answer in half an hour to a speech of an hour and a half, must be a hurried one he said. Douglas had never before asked him if he favored negro citizenship '[Applause]; he shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of negro citizenship. [Renewed applause.]' While the Dred Scott decision held that a State could not make a negro a citizen — although Lincoln thought it could — still, even 'if the State of Illinois had that power, I should be opposed to the exercise of it. [Cries of "Good, good," and applause.] That is all I have to say about it.'[4]

But as to slavery, there had been no peace and would not be, while 'it is kept in the position it now occupies.' Of course if we would let Douglas and his friends go on 'until they plant the institution all over the nation' there would be peace — but how would Douglas get the people to do that?

Douglas complained that Trumbull and Lincoln brought charges against him two years old, yet Douglas brought against him the Mexican War charge, which was ten years old, said Lincoln. Well, he would settle that! Dragging forward Ficklin who had been in Congress with him, Lincoln asked him to tell the crowd that '*he personally knows it to be a lie.*' He had voted against Democratic attempts to 'endorse the origin and justice of the war,' Lincoln admitted; but for supplies and by 'way of compensation or otherwise, for the benefit of soldiers, *I gave all*

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 299–300. [2] *Ib.*, 300–1. [3] *Ib.*, 302. [4] *Ib.*, 303.

the votes that Ficklin or Douglas did, and perhaps more. [Loud applause.]'

Avowing equal friendship for Lincoln and Douglas, Ficklin said only that Lincoln had voted for the Ashmun resolution that 'the Mexican War was unnecessary and unconstitutionally commenced.' True, said Lincoln; but that resolution was about 'the manner in which the war was *begun*.' The charge against him was that he had voted against supplies. When that charge was first made, Douglas's organ at Springfield had said that 'the charge really applies to John Henry [Lincoln's Whig predecessor in Congress], and I do know that John Henry *is now making speeches and fiercely battling for Judge Douglas.* [Loud applause.]' [1]

Lincoln gave the remainder of his time to a justification of Trumbull's charges against Douglas about the Toombs bill of 1856; in this part of his speech the words 'forgery,' 'forger,' 'liar,' 'stolen goods,' 'accused thief' were freely made use of, to the intense delight of the Republicans who sent up roars of laughter and gave cheer upon cheer.[2]

'THE GREAT TRIUMPH OF THE CAMPAIGN!' 'GREAT ROUT OF THE DOUGLASITES!' 'LINCOLN STRIPS THE GIANT DRY!' 'ABRAHAM TOSSED AGAIN!' 'LINCOLN . . . RUBS AT THE SPOT!' Headlines like these, above long descriptions even stronger, were the manner in which the partisan press told its readers of the outcome of the debate.

In spite of heavy rains the day before and 'a fiercely blowing, cutting wind' on the day of the debate at Galesburg on October 7, the biggest crowd of the campaign gathered at the charming college town. There were reception speeches, presentations of banners to each combatant by the students; and the rival partisans exhausted their ingenuity upon campaign mottoes, inscriptions, and devices.

Here for the first time we get a description of a campaign legend which played great and effective part in this contest, and is to have stronger influence in electing Lincoln to the Presidency and, indeed, in getting soldiers to enlist when he called for them. During the Lecompton debate in the Senate, Hammond of South

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 307. Italics Lincoln's. [2] *Ib.*, 307–11.

Carolina, in speaking of the economic basis of slavery, had made use of a phrase which the Republicans promptly seized upon, repeated, and made a Northern battle cry.

On one of his plantations Hammond had just been building a structure on soggy ground, which had to be erected on sills sunk in the mud. So he gave that as an illustration of slavery: the rough work had to be done by strong, unskilled labor, directed by superior intelligence; and the South had this at hand. It was the same with all such necessary toil, he said — workers of that kind were the 'mud-sills of society.' It was so in the North under the 'hireling system,' he said, as well as at the South under the slavery system.

The Republican press, politicians and speakers promptly took up these picturesque words, and told Northern workingmen, farmers, and laborers of all kinds, that the South had branded them as 'mud-sills.' The effect was immense. So among the banners at Galesburg, was one upon which this sentence flamed:

'SMALL-FISTED FARMERS, MUD-SILLS OF SOCIETY, GREASY MECHANICS, FOR A. LINCOLN.' [1]

The contestants were now in territory that was overwhelmingly Republican, in the radical sense of that term, and both men recognized that fact in what they said.

Lincoln made two new points. It was no test of the truth of a doctrine that it could not be proclaimed everywhere — Douglas could not preach his democracy in Russia, for instance — so what became of the cry that the Republican Party was sectional? Republicans could not advocate their principles in the South because the people there would not let them. According to his rule, Douglas himself was becoming sectional '[Great cheers and laughter],' for 'his speeches would not go as current now south of the Ohio as they have formerly gone there. [Loud cheers.]' [2]

The other point was that slavery was a 'wrong,' whereas Douglas 'discards the idea that there is anything wrong in slavery.' To him there was no difference between 'slavery and liberty.' If Douglas thought there was, he could not assert, as he had

[1] *Galesburg Democrat*, Oct. 9, 1858, as quoted in *Debates:* Sparks, 375. [2] *Ib.*, 349–50.

done, that 'he don't care whether slavery is voted up or down.' [1]

Lincoln believed slavery to be 'a moral, social, and political evil,' he said, and having due regard to Constitutional guarantees, he wanted 'a policy that looks to the prevention of it as a wrong, and looks hopefully to the time when as a wrong it may come to an end. [Great applause.]' That was the 'real difference between Judge Douglas and his friends on the one hand, and the Republicans on the other.' [2]

In Lincoln's opinion — the opinion of 'one very humble man' — the Dred Scott decision never would have been rendered 'if the party that made it had not been sustained previously by the elections;' and the new Dred Scott decision that a State could not exclude slavery, never would be made 'if that party is not sustained by the elections. [Cries of "Yes," "yes."] I believe, further, that it is just as sure to be made as tomorrow is to come, if that party shall be sustained. ["We won't sustain it;" "Never;" "Never."]' Moreover, the argument which Douglas was making 'is preparing the public mind for that new Dred Scott decision.' For his support of the first Dred Scott decision 'commits him to the next decision . . . without enquiring whether it is right or wrong.'

In short, Douglas was 'preparing (whether purposely or not) the way for making the institution of slavery national! [Cries of "Yes, yes;" "That's so."] . . . I do not charge that he means it so; . . . but could you find an instrument so capable of doing it as Judge Douglas, or one employed in so apt a way to do it? [Great cheering. Cries of "Hit him again;" "That's the doctrine."]' [3]

If Douglas's policy should win, not only would slavery be spread over the whole Nation, but 'the next thing will be a grab for the territory of poor Mexico, an invasion of the rich lands of South America, then the adjoining islands will follow, each one of which promises additional slave-fields.' Remember, too, that the power to acquire new territory was vested in the President and Senate.[4]

[1] Notes taken by Horace White of Lincoln's speech at Edwardsville, Sept. 13, show that he used this argument and words on that occasion.

[2] *Debates*: Sparks, 352–3. [3] *Ib.*, 359–61. [4] *Ib.*, 362–3.

When Lincoln closed 'three tremendous cheers for Lincoln from the whole vast audience were given with great enthusiasm.'[1]

Lincoln had complained that Douglas made the same speech everywhere, began the Little Giant in reply. 'I wish I could only say the same of his speech. ["Good; you have him," and applause.] . . . He makes one speech north, and another south. ["That's so."] . . . All I asked of him was that he should deliver the speech that he has made here to-day in Coles County [Charleston] instead of in old Knox [Galesburg]. It would have settled the question between us in that doubtful county. . . .

'He tells you to-day that the negro was included in the Declaration of Independence when it is asserted that all men were created equal. ["We believe it."] Very well. [Here an uproar arose; persons in various parts of the crowd indulging in cat calls, groans, cheers, and other noises, preventing the speaker from proceeding.]'[2]

No one interrupted Lincoln, said Douglas, and he insisted on the same treatment. Lincoln also appealed for 'silence.'[3]

If, as Lincoln had said to-day and in Chicago, the equality phrase in the Declaration included negroes '["Ain't that so?"] . . . how came he to say at Charleston to the Kentuckians residing in that section of our State that the negro was physically inferior to the white man, belonged to an inferior race, and he [Lincoln] was for keeping him always in that inferior condition? ["Good."]' Yet here in Galesburg, Lincoln makes it a moral question. ['"He's right."] Is he right now, or was he right in Charleston?' shot back Douglas.[4]

How absurd for Lincoln to say that Douglas could not preach democracy in Russia, and give that as an answer to the Douglas principle that a man should hold the same doctrines throughout the length and breadth of this Republic! 'I would remind him that Russia is not under the American Constitution. ["Good," and laughter.]' If it were, 'I would maintain the same doctrine in Russia that I do in Illinois. [Cheers.]'

But the South was governed by the same Constitution as the North, and 'whenever a man advocates one set of principles in one section, and another set in another section, his opinions are

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 365. [2] *Ib.* [3] *Ib.*, 365–6. [4] *Ib.*, 366.

in violation of the Constitution which he has sworn to support. ["That's so."]' When Lincoln in Congress took an oath 'that he would be faithful to the Constitution, what did he mean — the Constitution as he expounds it in Galesburg, or the Constitution as he expounds it in Charleston? [Cheers.]' [1]

Lincoln 'knew better' when he asserted that Douglas would 'sanction the doctrine that would allow slaves to be brought here and held as slaves contrary to our [State] Constitution and laws; . . . that there is not a member of the Supreme Court that holds that doctrine; . . . that every one of them, as shown by their opinions, holds the reverse. Why this attempt, then, to bring the Supreme Court into disrepute among the people?'

If Lincoln should succeed in that, 'he will have changed the Government from one of laws into that of a mob. . . . I stand by the laws of the land ["That's it; hurrah for Douglas."] I stand by the Constitution as our fathers made it, by the laws as they are enacted, and by the decisions of the courts, upon all points within their jurisdiction as they are pronounced by the highest tribunal on earth, and any man who resists these must resort to mob law and violence to overturn the government of laws.' The reporter makes note that when Douglas closed 'the applause was perfectly furious and overwhelming.' [2]

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 366–7.

[2] *Ib.*, 370–2. [In the *Boston Daily Evening Transcript*, Oct. 13, 1858, appeared a letter, dated Oct. 7, from a correspondent in Galesburg, Ill. A part of the communication was reprinted in its issue of May 19, 1860, after Lincoln's nomination at Chicago, with the statement that it was written by the President of a College in Illinois, 'a gentleman well known in New England, and particularly esteemed in Boston.' This description indicates Edward Beecher, who was at the time of the debates in charge of a church in Galesburg and had been from 1844 to 1855 pastor of a church in Boston. After an account of the greeting given to each speaker, the writer continued:

'The men are entirely dissimilar. Mr. Douglas is a thick-set, finely-built courageous man, and has an air of self-confidence that does not a little inspire his supporters with hope. Mr. Lincoln is a tall, lank man, awkward, apparently diffident, and when not speaking has neither firmness in his countenance nor fire in his eye. . . .

'Though not a pleasant speaker, his [Douglas's] sentences are all compact and strong, his points are all clear, and every word he utters bears upon the doctrine he wishes to establish. He has no flights of fancy, no splendid passages, no prophetic appeals, no playful turns; he deals only in argument, and addresses only the intellect.

'Mr. Lincoln has a rich, silvery voice, enunciates with great distinctness, and has a fine command of language. He commenced by a review of the points Mr. Douglas had made. In this he showed great tact, and his retorts, though gentlemanly, were sharp, and reached to the core of the subject in dispute. . . . For about forty minutes, he spoke

The partisan press made the same old extravagant boasts for their respective champions, as before. On October 13 came the debate at Quincy, where old line Whigs were in numbers. Lincoln read from his speech of 1854 the same passages he had read at Ottawa, to show that his views on negro equality were the same as those stated at Charleston. There had been no double dealing, he said — 'at least, I deny it so far as the intention is concerned.' [1]

Lincoln asked Douglas to point out in the Dred Scott decision, where any one of the majority Justices of the Supreme Court had said that the *States* had a right to exclude slavery. If McLean and Curtis 'had asked to get an express declaration that the States could absolutely exclude slavery from their limits, what reason have we to believe that they would not have been voted down by the majority of the judges, just as Chase's amendment was voted down by Judge Douglas and his compeers when it was offered in the Nebraska bill. [Cheers.]' [2]

We must bear in mind that Lincoln was here making a stump speech to a popular audience in a furious political fight, and not a legal argument to a court. Indeed, we must remember that the Republican position then was that a judicial decision was as much a matter of party politics as a legislative vote. As has appeared, moreover, the heart of the Republican assault was that the Dred Scott decision was part of a great conspiracy to extend slavery, and that, when the time was ripe, another Dred Scott decision would be made as required by the plot.

For the second time in the debates, Lincoln declared that the basic issue was the wrong of slavery as against indifference to

with a power that we have seldom heard equalled. There was a grandeur in his thoughts, a comprehensiveness in his arguments, and a binding force in his conclusions, which were perfectly irresistible. The vast throng was silent as death; every eye was fixed upon the speaker, and all gave him serious attention. He was the tall man eloquent; his countenance glowed with animation, and his eye glistened with an intelligence that made it lustrous. He was no longer awkward and ungainly; but graceful, bold, commanding. Mr. Douglas had been quietly smoking up to this time; but here he forgot his cigar and listened with anxious attention. When he rose to reply, he appeared excited, disturbed, and his second effort seemed to us vastly inferior to his first. Mr. Lincoln had given him a great task, and Mr. Douglas had not time to answer him, even if he had the ability.' — W. C. F.]

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 397–400; White in Herndon and Weik, II, 123.

[2] *Debates:* Sparks, 400–1.

the moral phase of the subject. Even those Democrats who said it was wrong, objected to 'anybody else saying so.'

'You say it must not be opposed in the Free States, because slavery is not here; it must not be opposed in the Slave States, because it is there; it must not be opposed in politics, because that will make a fuss; it must not be opposed in the pulpit, because it is not religion. [Loud cheers.] Then where is the place to oppose it?' Yet it was 'overspreading the continent.' But it was a 'wrong' and must be treated so. '[Prolonged cheers.]' [1]

What question had Lincoln discussed upon which a Senator could act? asked Douglas, in reply.[2] As to the moral questions, let the people of each State decide for themselves. 'I hold that the people of the slave-holding States are civilized men as well as ourselves, that they bear consciences as well as we, and that they are accountable to God and their posterity, and not to us. It is for them to decide, therefore, the moral and religious right of the slavery question for themselves, within their own limits. . . . Let each State mind its own business and let its neighbors alone, and there will be no trouble on this question. . . .

'It does not become Mr. Lincoln, or anybody else, to tell the people of Kentucky that they have no consciences, that they are living in a state of iniquity, and that they are cherishing an institution to their bosoms in violation of the law of God. Better for him to adopt the doctrine of "Judge not, lest ye shall be judged." ["Good," and applause.]'

Thus, for the second time, did Douglas apply to Lincoln the scriptural quotation that Lincoln himself is to direct to the fire-eaters of his own party as the war drew to a close; and Douglas laid emphasis upon it: there were enough 'objects of charity in the Free States' to attend to 'without going abroad in search of negroes, of whose condition we know nothing.' [3]

In his rejoinder, Lincoln said that the trouble with Douglas was that he 'could not let it [slavery] stand upon the basis where our fathers placed it, but removed it, and *put it upon the cotton-gin basis.* [Roars of laughter and enthusiastic applause.] . . . Why could they not let it remain where the fathers of the

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 404–7. [2] *Ib.*, 417. [3] *Ib.*, 425–7.

Government originally placed it. [Cheers and cries of "Hurrah for Lincoln;" "Good;" "Good."]' [1]

Douglas would not say 'whether, if a decision [by the Supreme Court] is made, holding that the people of the States cannot exclude slavery he will support it or not. . . . The Judges of the Supreme Court as obstinately refused to say what they would do on this subject. . . . Now, Judge Douglas understands the Constitution according to the Dred Scott decision, and he is bound to support it as he understands it. [Cheers.] I understand it another way, and therefore I am bound to support it in the way I understand it. [Prolonged applause.]' [2]

Douglas had 'sang pæans' to his Popular Sovereignty until his Supreme Court had '*squatted* his Squatter Sovereignty out. [Uproarious laughter and applause.]. . . He has at last invented this sort of *do-nothing Sovereignty*, [Renewed laughter] — that the people may exclude slavery by a sort of "Sovereignty" that is exercised by doing nothing at all. [Continued laughter.] Is not that running his Popular Sovereignty down awfully? [Laughter.] Has it not got down as thin as the homeopathic soup that was made by boiling the shadow of a pigeon that had starved to death? [Roars of laughter and cheering.] . . .

'The Dred Scott decision covers the whole ground, and while it occupies it, there is no room even for the shadow of a starved pigeon to occupy the same ground. [Loud cheers and laughter. A voice on the platform — "Your time is almost out." Long cries of "Go on, go on; we'll listen all day."]' This was Lincoln's conclusion at Quincy of his Jonesboro point, that members of a Territorial Legislature were bound to protect slavery under the Dred Scott interpretation of the Constitution and that they could not, 'by withholding necessary laws, or by passing unfriendly laws, *nullify that Constitutional right.*' [3]

In closing, Lincoln denied that he had said that the 'Democratic' owners of Dred Scott got up the case. 'I never did say that. [Applause.]' He had only said the owners, without designating their politics, insisted Lincoln. 'I defy Judge Douglas to show that I ever said so, *for I never uttered* it. [One of Mr. Douglas's reporters gesticulated affirmatively at Mr. Lincoln.]

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 428. [2] *Ib.*, 430. [3] *Ib.*, 431–2.

I don't care if your hireling does say I did, I tell you myself, that *I never said the "Democratic" owners of Dred Scott got up the case.* [Tremendous enthusiasm.] I have never pretended to know whether Dred Scott's owners were Democrats, or Abolitionists, or Free-Soilers or Border Ruffians. I have said that there is evidence about the case tending to show that it was a made up case, for the purpose of getting that decision. I have said that that evidence was very strong in the fact that when Dred Scott was declared to be a slave, the owner of him made him free, showing that he had had the case tried and the question settled for such use as could be made of that decision; he cared nothing about the property thus declared to be his by that decision. [Enthusiastic applause.] But my time is out and I can say no more.' [1]

Luckily, we have a fairly impartial account of the Quincy gathering. A brilliant young German, twenty-nine years of age, then living in Wisconsin, had been asked by the Republican Central Committee to make some speeches in that State. One of his assignments was at Quincy, on the night of the day when the debate took place. The young man's name was Carl Schurz. While a fiery antagonist of slavery, and no less of the South too, and, at that time, an uncompromising Republican, Schurz strove to keep his prejudices from influencing his statements of fact as to what he saw and heard.

This young German was to play a not unimportant part in Lincoln's life and in the history of the period. In the campaign to elect Lincoln to the Presidency, we shall hear Schurz make a speech in which war drums throb and bayonets gleam, challenge to the South blaring like a bugle sounding the charge. His intelligence was as keen as his emotion was intense, he was inordinately ambitious for distinction and advancement, and he was the sharpest observer of the time of American customs, and especially of the looks, manners, and methods of prominent men in politics, particularly of those who were speakers on the stump.

Schurz's description of Lincoln and Douglas in debate and of the picturesque features of an American campaign meeting at

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 435. Italics Lincoln's.

that day is so photographic, that it must be reproduced almost entire. It is the best account of the kind. Yet it is not wholly without bias, for Schurz was a devoted Lincoln man and violently hated Douglas whom he had seen before in Washington; and we must bear these facts in mind when reading what he says about the two men.

Schurz was on the train for Quincy when, at a station, Lincoln got aboard. 'Hello, Abe! How are you?' cried the other passengers, who crowded about the candidate. 'Good evening, Ben!' 'How are you, Joe?' 'Glad to see you, Dick!' responded Lincoln. Some one introduced the youthful German Republican stump speaker. Schurz was 'somewhat startled' by Lincoln's height, he records: 'There he stood, overtopping by several inches all those surrounding him. Although measuring something over six feet myself, I had, standing quite near to him, to throw my head backward in order to look into his eyes.' Lincoln's face was swarthy, features strong and deeply furrowed, eyes benignant and melancholy. His face was clean shaven 'and looked even more haggard and careworn than later when it was framed in whiskers.'

On his head Lincoln wore 'a somewhat battered "stove-pipe" hat. His neck emerged, long and sinewy, from a white collar turned down over a thin black necktie. His lank, ungainly body was clad in a rusty black dress-coat with sleeves that should have been longer; but his arms appeared so long that the sleeves of a "store" coat could hardly be expected to cover them all the way down to the wrists. His black trousers, too, permitted a very full view of his large feet. On his left arm he carried a gray woolen shawl, which evidently served him for an overcoat in chilly weather. His left hand held a cotton umbrella of the bulging kind, and also a black satchel that bore the marks of long and hard usage.

'His right hand he had kept free for handshaking, of which there was no end until everybody in the car seemed to be satisfied. I had seen, in Washington and in the West, several public men of rough appearance; but none whose look seemed quite so uncouth not to say grotesque, as Lincoln's.' [1]

[1] *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, II, 89–90.

Lincoln received Schurz 'with off-hand cordiality, like an old acquaintance' and, told what the young German was there for, sat down with him. In a 'somewhat high-pitched but pleasant voice,' he told the foreign-born Republican recruit about the debates and the points Lincoln meant to make at Quincy. What did Schurz think of them and other matters? asked Lincoln 'in a tone of perfect ingenuousness.' The young orator — a mere 'beginner in politics' — was inclined to be overcome by the honor of Lincoln's confidence; but Lincoln simply would not let Schurz 'regard him as a great man. He talked in so simple and familiar a strain, and his manner and homely phrase were so absolutely free from any semblance of self-consciousness or pretension to superiority, that I soon felt as if I had known him all my life and we had long been close friends.' So with quaint stories by Lincoln, each of which wittily settled a point, and which Lincoln, a merry twinkle in his eye, enjoyed like a child, always leading the laughter at his own jokes until all joined in, the train sped toward Quincy.[1]

The town was full of movement and sound that night, brass bands playing, Republicans and Democrats, 'not in all cases quite sober,' shouting for Lincoln or Douglas and keeping it up 'until the small hours.' Lincoln wanted to walk to Browning's where he stopped, but the committee had a carriage in waiting for him and he rode. Next day the familiar scenes were repeated, delegations with banners led by 'maidens in white with tri-colored scarfs, . . . whose beauty was duly admired by everyone, including themselves.' But Schurz thought that, 'on the whole, the Democratic displays were more elaborate and gorgeous than those of the Republicans, and it was said that Douglas had plenty of money to spend for such things.'

The Little Giant 'travelled in what was called in those days "great style," with a secretary and servants and a numerous escort of somewhat loud companions, . . . by special train with cars specially decorated for the occasion, all of which contrasted strongly with Lincoln's extremely modest simplicity.' The crowds cheered and shouted and jostled in good-natured fashion, and gibed and jeered one another with a laugh. Schurz was given

[1] *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, II, 91.

a seat on the platform and heard and saw what went on. In front, the thousands stood peaceably, 'chaffing one another now and then in a good-tempered way.' Schurz thought that Lincoln's refutation of Douglas's statements at previous meetings may have been required, but 'it did not strike me as anything extraordinary, either in substance or in form,' he relates.

'Neither had Mr. Lincoln any of those physical advantages which usually are thought to be very desirable, if not necessary, to the orator. His voice was not musical, rather high-keyed, and apt to turn into a shrill treble in moments of excitement; but it was not positively disagreeable. It had an exceedingly penetrating, far-reaching quality. The looks of the audience convinced me that every word he spoke was understood at the remotest edges of the vast assemblage. His gesture was awkward. He swung his long arms sometimes in a very ungraceful manner. Now and then he would, to give particular emphasis to a point, bend his knees and body with a sudden downward jerk, and then shoot up again with a vehemence that raised him to his tiptoes and made him look much taller than he really was — a manner of enlivening a speech which at that time was . . . not unusual in the West, but which he succeeded in avoiding at a later period.

'There was, however, in all he said, a tone of earnest truthfulness, of elevated, noble sentiment, and of kindly sympathy, which added greatly to the strength of his argument, and became, as in the course of his speech he touched upon the moral side of the question in debate, powerfully impressive. Even when attacking his opponent with keen satire or invective, which, coming from any other speaker, would have sounded bitter and cruel, there was still a certain something in his utterance making his hearers feel that those thrusts came from a reluctant heart, and that he would much rather have treated his foe as friend.'

Schurz wondered what Douglas would say, when his time came to make answer. What could he say? While Lincoln's speech was not 'an overwhelming argument,' it was so 'very clear, logical, persuasive, convincing even,' that the immigrant

student of American stump speaking did not see how Douglas could refute it, although he might, 'with his cunning sophistry,' neutralize its effect. So when Douglas rose to speak, Schurz was all ears and eyes. 'By the side of Lincoln's tall, lank, and ungainly form, Douglas stood almost like a dwarf, very short of stature, but square-shouldered and broad-chested, a massive head upon a strong neck, the very embodiment of force, combativeness, and staying power. . . . He looked rather natty and well groomed in excellently fitting broadcloth and shining linen. But his face seemed a little puffy, and it was said that he had been drinking hard with some boon companions either on his journey or after his arrival' — a charge which the Republicans made against Douglas everywhere and increasingly. 'The deep, horizontal wrinkle between his keen eyes was unusually dark and scowling. While he was listening to Lincoln's speech, a contemptuous smile now and then flitted across his lips, and when he rose, the tough parliamentary gladiator, he tossed his mane with an air of overbearing superiority, of threatening defiance, as if to say: "How dare anyone stand up against me?"

'As I looked at him, I detested him deeply; but my detestation was not free from an anxious dread as to what was to come. His voice, naturally a strong baritone, gave forth a hoarse and rough, at times even something like a barking, sound. His tone was, from the very start, angry, dictatorial, and insolent in the extreme. In one of his first sentences he charged Lincoln with "base insinuations," and then he went on in that style with a wrathful frown upon his brow, defiantly shaking his head, clenching his fists, and stamping his feet.

'No language seemed to be too offensive for him, and even inoffensive things he would sometimes bring out in a manner which sounded as if intended to be insulting; and thus he occasionally called forth, instead of applause from his friends, demonstrations of remonstrance from the opposition. But his sentences were well put together, his points strongly accentuated, his argumentation seemingly clear and plausible, . . . his appeals to prejudice unprincipled and reckless, but shrewdly aimed, and his invective vigorous and exceedingly trying to the temper of the assailed party. On the whole, his friends were

well pleased with his performance, and rewarded him with vociferous cheers.' [1]

But in his rejoinder, says Schurz, Lincoln 'replied to Douglas's arguments and attacks with rapid thrusts so deft and piercing, with humorous retort so quaint and pat, and with witty illustrations so clenching, and he did it so good-naturedly, that the meeting, again and again, broke out in bursts of delight by which even many of his opponents were carried away, while the scowl on Douglas's face grew darker and darker.' [2]

Two days later, on October 15, Lincoln and Douglas held their last debate at Alton, before a gathering almost as small as that at Jonesboro.[3] Here the Administration Democrats, who had been assailing Douglas even more fiercely than the Republicans had attacked him, invaded the meeting itself. Their candidate for Congress for that District, one Dr. Hope, found a place on the stand and, when Douglas rose to open the debate, asked him whether he believed that 'Territorial Legislatures ought to pass laws to protect slavery in the territories.'

'You will get an answer in the course of my remarks,' Douglas retorted, and the crowd applauded. Suppose Lincoln's idea that the Nation must be all slave or all free had ruled the makers of the Constitution: the country would have been made all slave permanently, for twelve of the States then had slavery and only one did not. Wiser than Lincoln, the founders of the Republic left that and all domestic questions to the States; and through the working of that principle, one State after another had abolished slavery until the free States were in the majority of both Houses of Congress — yes, and now had the power to elect a President 'without the aid of a Southern State.' Would the people of the North abandon that principle of local self-government now, just because they had the strength to do so, 'and wage war against the Southern States and their institutions un-

[1] Schurz, II, 94–5.

[2] *Ib.*, 95–6. Part of Schurz's account, first published in *McClure's Magazine*, is also in *Debates:* Sparks, 446–8.

[3] White, in Herndon and Weik, II, 124. Mrs. Lincoln came from Springfield and she and Lincoln were at the Franklin House. Douglas stopped at the Alton House, where his room was crowded by visitors all the time.

til you force them to abolish slavery everywhere? ["No, never;" and great applause.]' [1]

The Administration candidate for Congress would better not have aroused Douglas, for the Little Giant struck back without mercy. All that he had said against the Administration forces, he now repeated in words and tone of fury. They were helping the Republicans everywhere in the State against the Democratic Party, cried Douglas; the President had ordered him how to vote and threatened to remove his friends from office if he did not obey. Douglas had replied to Buchanan: 'You did not elect me. I represent Illinois, and I am accountable to Illinois, as my constituency, and to God; but not to the President or any other power on earth. ["Good, good," and vociferous applause.]'

The Administration men were now waging war on Douglas, he said, because he would not obey executive orders as to how he should vote in the Senate. '["Never do it;" "three cheers," etc.]' Dictation by a President to the Senate was 'subversive of the principles of our Constitution.' Permit such a course of action by a President and 'you convert this Government from a republic to a despotism. ["Hear, Hear," and cheers.]' [2]

National men must rally to the defence of national principles; for sectionalists were uniting on the one question of slavery, and their 'treasonable designs' must be thwarted. In former times, Whigs and Democrats fought one another at the polls about banks, tariff, and the like, but 'all united as a band of brothers when the peace, harmony, or integrity of the Union was imperilled. [Tremendous applause.]' That was what patriotism and good sense required now.

Douglas read from Buchanan's letter accepting the Presidential nomination, that 'the people of a Territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits' — a principle 'as ancient as free government itself.' There, said Douglas, Dr. Hope would find the answer to his question.

Let each Territory and State mind its own business and there would be no trouble. Why permit a sectional party to rend the Nation 'merely that a few ambitious men may ride into power

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 454–5. [2] *Ib.*, 460–1.

on a sectional hobby?' Not one of them dreamed of a sectional party while the South was the stronger section; only when the North grew strong enough to elect a sectional President, did 'ambitious Northern men' try to excite the sections against each other and to induce American citizens to vote according to geographical lines.[1]

Amid cheers, cries of approval, 'uproarious laughter' and like demonstrations, Lincoln told of his pleasure at Douglas's attack on the Administration: 'Go it, husband! — Go it bear! [Great laughter.]' But why should Douglas complain that the President was inconsistent? Had not Buchanan 'as much right to be inconsistent as Douglas has? [Loud applause and laughter; "Good!" "Good;" "Hurrah for Lincoln."] Has Douglas the *exclusive right*, in this country, of being *on all sides of all questions?* . . . [Great laughter.]' [2]

By some accident, he had omitted heretofore to correct Douglas's statement that he complained of the Dred Scott decision for having held that a negro could not be a citizen of the United States. 'In point of fact it is *untrue*,' cried Lincoln. 'I never have complained *especially* of the Dred Scott decision because it held that a negro could not be a citizen.' His objection was, said Lincoln, that the Dred Scott decision was a 'portion of a system or scheme to make slavery national in this country' — that was what he had tried to prove in his house-divided speech.

'I mentioned as a fact,' that the Supreme Court had held that a negro could not be a citizen, for the purpose, 'as I supposed,' of preventing a negro from ever, under any circumstances, claiming the rights of citizenship under the Constitution. 'I stated that, without making any complaint of it at all;' and then went on to marshal the evidence 'tending to prove a combination and conspiracy to make the institution of slavery national' — that was all.[3]

Lincoln went on at great length, to show that his views of the negro had not changed, reading from his speeches and those of Clay. Three years ago no human being ever imagined that the Declaration of Independence did not include the negro — of

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 465–6.
[2] *Ib.*, 466–7. Italics Lincoln's.
[3] *Ib.*, 467–8.

course, Calhoun and others had '*denied the truth of it*,' but not the fact itself. Douglas and Taney had invented the new doctrine, and '*I combat it* as having an evil tendency, if not an evil design. I combat it as having a tendency to dehumanize the negro, to take away from him the right of ever striving to be a man. I combat it as being one of the thousand things constantly done in these days to prepare the public mind to make property, and nothing but property, of the *negro in all the States of this Union*. [Tremendous applause. "Hurrah for Lincoln. Hurrah for Trumbull."]' [1]

Ignoring the Abolition assault, Lincoln repeated in many forms the Republican assertion that there had been peace on the slavery question until the effort to extend slavery had begun. The great danger was that that effort would succeed; and, regardless of the moral wrong of slavery, he was against the spread of it, said Lincoln, because he wanted to keep the Territories for white men, 'where they can settle upon new soil and better their condition in life. [Great and continued cheering.]

'I am in favor of this, not merely (I must say it here as I have elsewhere) for our own people who are born amongst us, but as an outlet for *free white people everywhere*, the world over — in which Hans, and Baptiste, and Patrick, and all other men from all the world, may find new homes and better their condition in life. [Loud and long continued applause.]' This was, by far, the most effective appeal that Republican speakers made to voters. But 'the real issue' was the 'wrong' of slavery,[2] said Lincoln; Douglas and his friends did not think it a wrong nor look to an end of it.

So Lincoln was in favor of the war by the Administration against Douglas! was he, exclaimed Douglas when beginning his rejoinder. It was refreshing to learn that 'Mr. Lincoln is in favor of prosecuting one war vigorously. [Roars of laughter.] It is the first war I ever knew him to be in favor of prosecuting. [Renewed laughter.] It is the first war that I ever knew him to believe to be just or constitutional. [Laughter and cheers.]' All Federal officeholders were Lincoln's allies '["That's so."]' and

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 468–73. Italics Lincoln's. [2] *Ib.*, 480–5.

as such were running separate tickets so as to divide the Democratic Party, 'although the leaders all intend to vote directly the Abolition [Republican] ticket and only leave the greenhorns to vote this separate ticket who refuse to go into the Abolition [Republican] camp. [Laughter and cheers.]' [1]

At length and with effect Douglas went into a detailed account of how Lincoln had been against Clay and helped to defeat his nomination when he could have been elected. Then, too, it was Lincoln, Seward, and that coterie who 'got up that strife that I helped Clay to put down. [Tremendous applause.]' [2]

Was it true, asked Douglas, that slavery was the only thing that ever threatened the Union, as Lincoln kept saying all the time? What ignorance of American history! 'Did not Nullification once raise its head and disturb the peace of this Union in 1832? Was that the slavery question, Mr. Lincoln? Did not disunion raise its monster head during the last war with Great Britain? Was that the slavery question, Mr. Lincoln? The peace of this country has been three times disturbed, and the Union endangered, once during the war with Great Britain, once on the tariff question, and once on the slavery question. [Three cheers for Douglas.]'

The only use made of the slavery question was to arouse sectional strife. Let each State and Territory do as it pleased — attend to its own business — and the slavery question would settle itself. 'I care more for the great principle of self-government, . . . than I do for all the negroes in Christendom. [Cheers.] I would not endanger the perpetuity of this Union, I would not blot out the great inalienable rights of the white men, for all the negroes that ever existed. [Renewed applause.]' [3] Douglas closed with an appeal to 'stand by the Constitution as our fathers made it, obey the laws, . . . sustain the decisions of the Supreme Court and the constituted authorities.' [4]

The reporter of the debate states that for some minutes after Douglas had concluded the applause was 'perfectly deafening and overwhelming. He seemed to have carried his vast auditory entirely with him in sympathy and feeling, for their enthusiasm was boundless.' [5]

[1] *Debates:* Sparks, 488–9. [2] *Ib.*, 490–3. [3] *Ib.*, 492–3. [4] *Ib.*, 496. [5] *Ib.*

1858–1861

At this point the pen of the writer stopped, leaving the chapter in its first draft. At Mr. Beveridge's elbow were the volumes of the *Debates* and Schurz's *Autobiography*, open at the pages whence he had taken the last quotations or references. On the table, near his hand, were the heaps of notes prepared for the chapter, extracts from letters, newspapers, proceedings of conventions and legislatures, and photostats of the more important manuscripts he had found in public and private collections. From this mass he would have drawn the facts and phrases which would have given life to the summary of the debates, shown the personal and political influences at work throughout the land, and drawn a full picture of a battle that was, unfelt by the participants, big with fate of the Nation.

What was then passing in Illinois could not be understood for two years to come. An essential factor in political history and a turning point in Lincoln's life, the events of 1859 and 1860 must be measured in the result. Mr. Beveridge planned to close this portion of the Life of Lincoln with his inauguration, on March 4, 1861. All that had passed before the year of the debates had been but a preparation for what was to follow. The slow, uncertain, yet consistent, development of Lincoln's political faith and opportunity, described in such detail in these volumes, and as yet unknown outside of his own State and its immediate neighbors, left him at the end of the debates in a position of doubt. Were he to win the senatorship, he would be acclaimed, recognized for a notable victory, and possibly as one more candidate for the presidency. Were he defeated, the palm of victory would be with Douglas. For Lincoln the turn of a card was important; his whole future depended upon the outcome of the game he had entered. An outline of the events of the two years 1859–60 is called for, to indicate the succession of events and its influence upon his political fortunes.

On November 2, 1858, a cold and wet day, the election was held in Illinois. The Republicans elected the State officers, for the first time making Illinois a Republican State; but the Democrats still held a majority in both branches of the Legislature, and that, barring accidents, assured the reëlection of Douglas to the Senate. The strength of the Buchanan Democrats had proved negligible and the Douglas Democrats had polled a vote so much over that of 1856 that it could not be accounted for by growth of population. Lincoln claimed that the apportionment law gave his opponent a decided advantage. For Douglas it was a great personal triumph, no matter how explained. The event followed necessarily. On a joint ballot of the Legislature, January 6, 1859, by a strict party division, Douglas received fifty-four

and Lincoln forty-one votes. A telegram to Douglas from Lanphier gave the glory to God and the 'Sucker Democracy' for the victory; Douglas accepted it as the voice of the people.

Two days after the election, Lincoln wrote to Crittenden: 'The emotions of defeat at the close of a struggle in which I felt more than a merely selfish interest, and to which defeat the use of your name contributed largely, are fresh upon me;' but he made no complaint on the part Crittenden had played.[1] Before two weeks had passed he could treat the matter in joking vein with Judd. 'I have the pleasure to inform you that I am convalescent, and hoping these lines may find you in the same improving state of health. Doubtless you have suspected for some time that I entertain a personal wish for a term in the United States Senate; and had the suspicion taken the shape of a direct charge, I think I could not have truthfully denied it. But let the past as nothing be.' In serious mood he continued: 'The fight must go on. . . . I shall fight in the ranks, but I shall be in no one's way for any of the places.' The Republican votes are worth keeping together, the apportionment law must be altered and Trumbull's reëlection in 1860 must as far as possible be assured.[2] 'The fight must go on,' he wrote to another. 'The question is not half settled. New splits and divisions will soon be upon our adversaries, and we shall fuse again.'[3] The Democratic strength is waning. 'There will be another "blow up" in the Democracy. Douglas managed to be supported both as the best instrument to *break down*, and to *up-hold* the slave power. No ingenuity can keep this deception — this double position — up a great while.'[4]

The campaign had cost Lincoln heavily and he admitted to Judd at this time that he was 'absolutely without money now for even household purposes.' Yet, as he had had the post of honor in the contest, it was not for him to be 'over-nice' and he pledged himself for a contribution to meet the expenses of the Republican Committee.[5] Wearily he turned to seeking cases and fees, but not for a moment did he drop political affairs. The future action of the party absorbed him and he early took the ground that with no yielding of principle, in the long run the Republicans were certain to win. There must be no fusion and no compromises. Left to themselves the Democrats were driving to disaster and Douglas was the probable victim. With clear insight Lincoln saw that the 'majority of the democratic politicians of the nation meant to kill' Douglas, and their best method was to 'present him

[1] Lincoln to Crittenden, Nov. 4, 1858. *Works*, v, 90–1.

[2] Lincoln to Judd, Nov. 15, 1858. *Ib.*, 91–2.

[3] Lincoln to E. A. Paine, Nov. 19, 1858. Tracy, 95–6.

[4] Lincoln to B. C. Lundy, Nov. 26, 1858. *Ib.*, 96. And to Henry Asbury, Nov. 19, 1858. *Ib.*, 94.

[5] Lincoln to Judd, Nov. 16, 1858. *Ib.*, 93.

with no new test, let him into the Charleston Convention, and then outvote him, and nominate another.' Any other method would make Douglas the leader of the movement against the slave power, and break the Republican Party into fragments. 'The Republican principle can in no wise live with Douglas; and it is arrant folly now, as it was last spring, to waste time, and scatter labor already performed, in dallying with him.' [1] From that stand Lincoln never swerved and he encouraged his friends to maintain it unshaken.

Lincoln came out of the senatorial election with increased reputation. His party had received a majority of the popular vote [2] and the differences between the old line Whigs and the Republicans tended to grow less as his conservatism, his honesty and his gifts as an orator were admitted. Anti-Nebraska Democrats, like Trumbull, Judd, and Palmer, were intent upon making Lincoln Senator in the next election, and they had great influence, if not control, through the State administration. They recognized their debt to Lincoln incurred in the earlier contest of 1855, and were as ardent as the original Republicans in their support of him. The Democrats tended to maintain and widen their differences, while the Republicans were increasing in strength by a policy which brought to it a good part of the factions growing from the break-up of the Whig Party.

Lincoln's gain had been local and outside of Illinois interest had centered on Douglas; so much so, that neither encouragement nor assistance had been given to Lincoln. Urged by the Republican leaders and journals of the East to return Douglas to the Senate, the Republicans of Illinois resented the suggestion and argued that should that course be taken the party would be absorbed by Douglas and disappear not only in Illinois but throughout the land. Acting alone, they had polled a larger vote than the Democrats and intended to hold that vote for the next election, when they counted upon certain victory. Not one of the questions which divided North and South had been settled by the election of 1858, but the lines of division were more strictly drawn. Jefferson Davis, while the Lincoln-Douglas debates were in process, came to New England in search of health and presented the Southern position in modified yet unmistakable terms. The Territories should be open to all for settlement; the National Government had no constitutional power either to establish or to prohibit slavery anywhere; the individual should be protected in his constitutional rights, and the community should be allowed to determine all domestic questions as in its wisdom should seem best; Congress had

[1] Lincoln to Trumbull, Dec. 11, 1858. Tracy, 96–8.

[2] Republican vote for governor, 125,430; Democratic (Douglas) 121,609, National Democrats, 5,071. The Republican candidates for the Legislature were defeated in Sangamon, Morgan, Madison, Logan and Mason counties — those near Springfield and most closely connected with Lincoln.

no more power to pass on the manner of forming a constitution than it had right to dictate the instrument itself; the right of a State to enter the Union was a thing apart from the admission or exclusion of slave property. 'If the right existed to form a constitution at all the power of Congress was limited to the simple question, is it republican?'

On October 11, two days after Lincoln and Douglas had met at Galesburg, Davis spoke in Boston at a Democratic ratification meeting, and laid down a doctrine which was to prove fatal to Douglas and his popular sovereignty. Davis asserted the want of power in Congress to declare what should be property, in a territory or elsewhere, and the absence of power in the people of a territory to deprive any citizen of the United States subsequently migrating thither of those rights which belonged to him as an equal owner of the soil. Until the territory became a State the constitution and laws of the United States prevailed. 'The constitution recognizes all property; gives equal privileges to every citizen of the States; and it would be a violation of its fundamental principles to attempt any discrimination.' Four days after this speech was made Douglas at Alton claimed Davis as a supporter of his popular sovereignty,[1] but the two men were far apart on the real question involved. Agreeing that Congress had no power to establish or prohibit slavery anywhere — the doctrine of nonintervention — Davis asserted that only when a territory formed a State government could its people rule upon the right of a person to bring property into it, and 'no power upon earth has the right to decide it before that time.' Although six weeks had passed since Douglas had committed himself to the 'Freeport Doctrine,' it cannot be assumed that Davis had that particular statement in mind; but on November 16 Davis spoke before the Mississippi legislature and in straight terms opposed Douglas's doctrine and the application Douglas had made of his Portland address. 'The difference between us is as wide as that of one who would assert the right to rob from him who admitted the power.' In his tour of the South Douglas found the issue raised against him. By his question to Douglas at Freeport, Lincoln had given his rival into the hands of Davis and his followers.

The most prominent man in public life and the ablest man in his party, Douglas found himself in a position where his influence was certain to decrease. The senatorial election in Illinois left him entirely without Republican favor, putting an end to the plan of eastern Republicans of forming an alliance with him. It had also alienated a large part of the Democratic Party and made him as sectional as any Republican. He was as Northern as any Black Republican. The South more and more questioned his doctrine of popular sovereignty

[1] He used a few sentences from Davis's Portland speech of Aug. 24, 1858.

and his soundness on Democratic policy and the demands of the South. The bitterness of the Buchanan Administration against him was intensified and Cobb told Stephens that only over his dead body could Douglas ever be restored to the confidence of the Democracy of Georgia. Passing through the South, crossing to Cuba, Douglas entered at the port of New York and received ovations there and in Philadelphia which proved no indications of solid popularity. On arriving in Washington he found that his colleagues in the Senate had put him second on the Committee on Territories, as chairman of which he had won his greatest and most striking victories. In spite of these hostile influences he was the admitted leader of the Democrats and in forecasting the presidential canvass of 1860 the contest lay in the North between Douglas and Seward or some conservative Republican, and in the South, between Douglas and an increasingly hostile Democracy, ready to combine upon any candidate who could defeat him.

In the Nation Seward led the Republican Party through his long public service, his recognized abilities in debate and in party direction, and his control in New York politics. However radical had been some of his public utterances in the past, he had never been indifferent to actual conditions and what was possible in the practical way under them. In the last week of the campaign and ten days after the final debate between Douglas and Lincoln in Illinois, Seward made at Rochester a speech in which he clearly stated the controversy between North and South. 'It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation or entirely a free-labor nation.' [1] He had often expressed the same idea without receiving the notice now given by friend and opponent. Seeming to echo the house-divided utterance of Lincoln, Seward's words took on a national importance. Parker applauded: 'He quite outruns his party, and no Republican paper in New England, I fear, has dared to republish them.' The *Springfield Republican* thought the speech impolitic, and liable to injure Seward and the party. Even the New York *Times*, favorable to Seward, criticized his doctrine. Herndon too questioned their prudence, wisdom, or sagacity; 'the people are still tender footed as a whole.' Lincoln later said that he agreed with Seward's 'irrepressible conflict,' but not with his 'higher law' doctrine, an exhibition of his caution in expressing his opinions.

Mention of Lincoln for President naturally followed the Republican victory in Illinois. On November 19, 1858, the *Olney Times* came out for him and a month later the *Chicago Press and Tribune* noted that the same suggestion had been made 'in various parts of the country,'

[1] Seward at Rochester, Oct. 25, 1858. *Works*, IV, 292.

and believed that an unbroken front on the part of Lincoln's friends at the proper time would make him the candidate in 1860.[1] His friend Pickett of the *Tazewell County Mirror* wrote to Lincoln on the question in April, 1859, and in reply was assured that Lincoln did not consider himself fit for the office, a position he maintained consistently through the year.[2] He sought to exclude from discussion whatever could divide the Republican vote — a naturalization rule such as Massachusetts had adopted; Ohio's demand for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law; and a leaning towards popular sovereignty; any one of which would reduce the Republican vote in Illinois, and prove a firebrand in a national convention. The party had one great object — to prevent the spread and nationalization of slavery, and that was a national question and must be attended to by the Nation.[3] Regarding Douglas as 'the most dangerous enemy of liberty, because the most insidious,' he would favor fusion in 1860 with other factions anywhere, but only on republican grounds.[4]

In the autumn of 1859 Lincoln and Douglas took part in the campaign in Ohio and thus carried on their debates of the previous year. The lines of difference were even more clearly defined. Douglas again urged his doctrine that local legislation would determine the existence of slavery in the Territories and welcomed the passage by New Mexico of a law protecting slaves, though no slaves were in the Territory. He again asserted his indifference whether slavery was voted up or voted down. In his speeches Lincoln made it plain that the chief danger to be met was in the 'Douglas popular sovereignty.' He made much of Douglas's admission at Freeport, that the people of a territory could lawfully exclude slavery from that territory, notwithstanding the Dred Scott decision. 'There was something about that answer that has probably been a trouble to the judge ever since.' It involved the absurdity that 'a thing may be lawfully driven away from where it has a lawful right to be.' Lincoln claimed that Douglas had not only never again stated since the Freeport speech that the people of the Territories could exclude slavery, but he had changed his ground and argued that under the Dred Scott decision, the Constitution did not

[1] *Chicago Press and Tribune*, Dec. 16, 1858.

[2] Lincoln to Pickett, April 16, 1859, and to Samuel Galloway, July 28, 1859. *Works*, v, 127, 136.

[3] Lincoln to Schuyler Colfax, July 6, 1859. *Ib.*, v, 131–3. The Ohio Republican State Convention adopted a plank calling for 'a repeal of the atrocious Fugitive Slave law.' Lincoln wrote to Chase, June 9, 1859: 'This is already damaging us here. I have no doubt that if that plank be even *introduced* into the next Republican National Convention, it will explode it. . . . I enter upon no argument one way or the other; but I assure you the cause of Republicanism is hopeless in Illinois, if it be in any way made responsible for that plank. I hope you can, and will, contribute something to relieve us from it.' MS.

[4] Lincoln to Canisius, May 17, 1859. *Ib.*, v, 129–30.

'carry slavery into the Territories beyond the power of the people of the Territories to control it as other property. He does not say the people can drive it out, but they can control it as other property.' [1] In denying that the negro had no share in the Declaration of Independence Douglas, said Lincoln, assigned to him the condition of a brute.[2]

That was not the Republican doctrine. What is wanted, Lincoln asserted, was a 'national policy which acknowledges and deals with slavery as a wrong.'[3] He clearly outlined the position of the Republicans: 'I say that we must not interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists, because the Constitution forbids it, and the general welfare does not require us to do so. We must not withhold an efficient fugitive slave law, because the Constitution requires us, as I understand it, not to withhold such a law. But we must prevent the outspreading of the institution, because neither the Constitution nor general welfare requires us to extend it. We must prevent the revival of the African slave-trade, and the enacting by Congress of a territorial slave-code. We must prevent each of these things being done by either congresses or courts. The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both congresses and courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.' [4]

Ohio went Republican by thirteen thousand majority and the Republicans carried both Pennsylvania and Iowa. Almost before the victories could be measured by the November elections came the raid of John Brown on Harper's Ferry. It produced an undue apprehension in the South, not wholly unwelcome to those who saw political advantage in the excitement aroused. The South charged the North with participation in the raid, or, if not actually taking part, with a want of sympathy for the South. Douglas denounced the raid and laid it to the teachings of the Republicans.[5] Lincoln, coldly and without feeling for Brown, described it as an absurd act of an enthusiast; [6] and Seward, admitting the earnest though fatally erroneous convictions of Brown, placed in contrast the better means of reaching the proposed ends — an appeal to the reason and judgment of the people.[7] The session of Congress in the winter of 1859–60 was embittered by the Brown raid and by a long contest over the Speakership of the House in which Helper's *Impending Crisis*, a violent attack by a Southerner upon slavery and especially the slave-holders, played an important part. In both bodies of Congress threats of secession on the part of the South

[1] Speech at Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 16, 1859. *Works*, v, 173–5.
[2] At Cincinnati, Sept. 16, 1859. *Ib.*, 201–2. [3] *Ib.*, 231.
[4] *Ib.*, 232. [5] *Cong. Globe*, 1st Sess. 36th Cong., 553–4.
[6] Cooper Union Speech, Feb. 27, 1860. [7] *Cong. Globe*, 1st Sess. 36th Cong.

were frequent and increasingly passionate. The election of a Black Republican president, said the leaders of the South, would end the Union, and of possible candidates Seward was the most hated and feared. Republican success in New York was believed to make the nomination of Seward certain in 1860, and to offer to the South a choice between submission to Sewardism or disunion. If Democrats, North and South, would act together he might be defeated; but a divided Democracy was an established fact. Howell Cobb thought Douglas out of the way, having lost his strength in both sections of the country; his proposal that a Southern man be nominated met with little response, though supported also by Toombs.[1]

Illinois Republicans had not yet accepted Lincoln beyond the status of a local offering. On September 28, 1859, Browning went to St. Louis to talk politics with Edward Bates and returned so much impressed by his ability as to look upon him as 'a most acceptable candidate for the Presidency, and I doubt not altogether the best man that the Republicans can support.' He arranged with Bates for a convention of all in Missouri opposed to the Administration, its nomination of Bates for President and the publication of his views on accepting. 'He is to maintain the absolute power of Congress over the Territories, inclusive of the question of slavery; to oppose the extension of slavery into free territory; to denounce the African slave trade, and to advocate the construction of the Pacific Railroad.'[2] In all his meetings with fellow Republicans Browning urged the availability of Bates. Even Judd, in October, would take him, 'if he shall appear to be the strongest man, and will put himself on Republican ground.'[3]

Lincoln was not inactive, but did not expect to be called by the party above the ranks, where he had 'enlisted for the permanent success of the Republican cause.'[4] His friends were urging his claims where they felt that influence could be carried. 'I would rather have a full term in the Senate than in the Presidency,' he wrote to Judd on December 9, 1859,[5] and while suggesting that the Republican National Convention should follow by a few days the Democratic Convention at Charleston, he did not attach much importance to having it in Illinois.[6] He was keen however in desiring to have all the support Illinois could give. On the evening of February 8, 1860, he talked with Browning, then at Springfield, and almost agreed that Bates might be the best man the Republicans could run; 'that he can get votes even in this county [Sangamon] that he [Lincoln] cannot get; and that there is a large class of voters in all the free States that would go for Bates,

[1] Cobb to Stephens, Nov. 14, 1859, and Toombs to Thomas, Dec. 4, 1859. *Am. Hist. Assn. Rept.*, 1911, II, 448, 450.

[2] Browning's *Diary*, I, 380. [3] *Ib.*, 382.

[4] Lincoln to W. E. Frazer, Nov. 1, 1859. *Works*, V, 257.

[5] *Ib.*, 282. [6] Lincoln to Judd, Dec. 14, 1859. *Ib.*, 283.

and for no other man.'[1] The next morning he wrote to Judd: 'I am not in a position where it would hurt much for me to not be nominated on the national ticket; but I am where it would hurt some for me to not get the Illinois delegates. . . . Can you not help me a little in this matter in your end of the Vineyard?' He ended with his usual hint: 'I mean this to be private.'[2]

Nor did Lincoln refuse invitations from other States. In the first week in December, 1859, he visited Kansas and spoke in five of the leading settlements, among which were Atchison and Leavenworth. Doubtless he had been influenced by Mark Delahay to accept the call, for Delahay hoped to be a United States Senator from Kansas, and had embarrassed Lincoln by asking for his aid.[3] He had received a more flattering request in October to deliver an address in Brooklyn, New York, in the church of Henry Ward Beecher. Accepting on condition that he might give a political paper, it led to a change in place and to his address in Cooper Institute, New York, on February 27, 1860, an occasion bringing him no little reputation in Republican circles in that city and throughout the East. The speech was not a mere repetition of what he had said in Illinois, Ohio, and Kansas, but gave a quite novel examination of how the 'fathers' had acted on the subject of slavery in the convention for framing the Constitution, in the Continental Congress on the government for the Northwest Territory, and in the early sessions of Congress under the Constitution. In no instance could he find any line dividing local from Federal authority, or anything properly forbidding the Federal Government 'to control as to slavery in Federal territory.' The argument turned upon Douglas's claim that 'Our fathers, when they framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now;' but Lincoln proved that the fathers were opposed to the Douglas doctrine.[4]

The speaker then turned to the Southern people and weighed their complaints against the North. He denied that the North was sectional, except so far as the South had made it so; that it was revolutionary, for the South sought something new, while the North maintained the old policy; that the North had made the slavery question more prominent than formerly, or that it could be held responsible for John Brown. The South threatened disunion, because it could not construe the Constitution as it wished on points in dispute with the North. Yet not only was the Dred Scot decision based on a mistaken statement of fact, but there had been a million and a half votes cast against slavery in the last election. Did the threat to destroy the Union, in

[1] Browning's *Diary*, I, 395.

[2] Lincoln to Judd, Feb. 9, 1860. *Works*, V, 290. See also his letter to Judd, Dec. 9, 1859. *Ib.*, 281.

[3] Lincoln to Delahay, Oct. 17, 1859. Tracy, 117.

[4] *Works*, V, 294–309.

the event of the election of a Republican president, differ from a highwayman's threat against the life of the man he meant to rob? What would satisfy the South? cried Lincoln. 'This, and this only: cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly — done in acts as well as in words. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our free-State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.' On that depended the whole controversy, and no compromise was possible.[1]

Much as Douglas was criticized and feared in his own party in the South, he was the strongest candidate to be offered to the Charleston Convention. No other candidate could obtain votes in the North. Willingly through his friends he gave the pledge, not unusual in such circumstances, that he would support any nominee of the Convention on any platform he should be put;[2] but his nomination was not conceded, nor, if nominated, did the South believe he could be elected, nor, if defeated in the Convention, did he have sufficient strength to name a candidate favorable to his policy. He had never brooked a rival. Breckinridge, the Vice-President, seemed to have a large following and came from a Border State, but Douglas told Toombs that Breckinridge 'was his last choice.' Nor was he cordial towards Hunter of Virginia, another Democratic possibility.[3] Confident of his own power, he saw no good reason for using it to endorse one who might become a rival.

The fight in Illinois between Douglas and the Administration continued and each faction sought to outweigh the other in preparing for the struggle at Charleston. Douglas, the stronger and more aggressive, summoned the Democratic State Convention to meet January 2, and his views dominated the gathering. The platform adopted in the National Convention of 1856 at Cincinnati was reaffirmed and the introduction of new issues discouraged. Controverted questions were to be submitted to the Supreme Court and the support of the party was pledged to the candidate to be named at Charleston. Six days later the Administration Democrats came together, chose a full delegation to Charleston and in their resolutions opposed all that the Douglas wing had endorsed. Two sets of delegates would contend for recognition at Charleston, just as two delegations would also apply from New York — added causes of discord in a situation of immense difficulty.

[1] *Works*, v, 310–28. From New York Lincoln went to Connecticut, speaking at Hartford, New Haven and Norwich, and at each place he aroused curiosity as a Western orator, and gave satisfaction by his presentation of the question at issue. *Ib.*, 329–71: vi, 1–15. Connecticut was a Democratic State, yet might be turned.

[2] Toombs to Stephens, Dec. 26, 1859. *Am. Hist. Assn. Rept.*, 1911, ii, 452.

[3] *Ib.*, Jan. 11, 1860. *Ib.*, 455.

On February 2, 1860, Davis introduced in the Senate his resolutions intended to head off Douglas at Charleston. The fourth resolution was directed against Douglas's doctrine of unfriendly legislation. Adopted in caucus by all the Southern Senators and by all the Democratic Senators from the North, except Douglas and Pugh, they asserted a doctrine which required the sacrifice of that which Douglas had made the foundation of his policy. They left no ground for compromise and if adopted by the Convention would mean the death of the Democratic Party at the North. When the Charleston Convention met on April 23 the Davis resolutions had accomplished their purpose.

The Convention opened its proceedings with a large attendance and a feeling of great uncertainty. The sole question before it was how to dispose of Douglas; all else turned upon the decision of that problem. The Northern delegates supported Douglas and his insistence on the adoption of the Cincinnati platform of 1856, without change in its terms. The South was bent upon ending his leadership, denying that he represented the true Democratic Party. The Administration threw what little influence it had with the South. Should he be made the candidate, the Southern States would withdraw from the Convention. The Illinois and New York contests were decided in favor of Douglas and gave him a majority of votes in the Convention but not a majority of the States, and he was still far from having the two-thirds of the votes necessary to a choice. Led by Richardson, with Ficklin, Merrick, and Linder among the aids, the delegation from Illinois showed fine organization, courage, and resourcefulness, and from the first carried on an aggressive attack. The South, however, without a candidate or a policy other than sectional, fought as a unit. If it could not win, it could at least destroy the political prestige of Douglas, deprive him of all support from the slave States. The Convention at once developed irreconcilable contests — Douglas and anti-Douglas, popular sovereignty and the protection of slave property in the Territories.

The Committee on Resolutions reported two platforms. The one from the majority of the Committee satisfied the Southern claims but could win the support of only a minority of the Convention; the other, the platform desired by Douglas, gained the majority of the Convention but at the cost of disruption. On the seventh day the secession of the Southern delegations followed the adoption of the Douglas platform and before the nomination of candidates. The departure of a small number of hostile votes might have made it possible for Douglas to secure the required two-thirds of the Convention; but the South went out as a whole and no one could deny the fatal weakness of setting up a purely sectional candidate, opposed by the strongest elements of the party. To name Douglas for the Presidency would end all hope of

victory, destroy the party and would even lead to the end of the Union. Yet nominations were made. Fifty-seven ballots were taken, only to prove that Douglas, leading throughout, could not win. Admitting failure, the Convention adjourned on the tenth day, to meet at Baltimore on the eighteenth of June.

Whatever expectation had rested on possible changes in the delegations vanished when the Convention reassembled. Factional feeling had been increased in the interval by the debates in the Senate between Douglas and his opponents. The South sent representatives, but a number were of those who had bolted at Charleston, and it was believed that they now sought admission only to repeat the secession. Before the discussion on credentials had ended a rumor spread of a letter from Douglas to Dean Richmond, leader of the New York delegation, withdrawing his name. Richardson and the straight Douglas men denied the existence of such a letter, and because of his close relations with Douglas the word of Richardson was taken. Yet from the beginning Richardson had in his pocket a like letter which, he later said, he could not use because of the confusion in the Convention. On the evening of the fifth day, June 22, finding the decision on delegates going against them, the Virginians left in a body. All or a part of the delegations from other Southern States followed until a majority of the States was affected, and the President of the Convention, Caleb Cushing, resigned his office.

On the sixth day, June 23, Douglas was nominated by the greatly diminished body, whose sorry claim to represent the National Democratic Party was belied in every respect. The fight had become one against a man presumed to be the favorite of the Nation, and it went further. The struggle for control at Charleston presented to the country the tragedy of the disruption of the great Democratic Party, the only one which could be regarded as national. What followed at Baltimore formed an anti-climax, and Douglas won the coveted honor under conditions that deprived him of all prospect of success.

Fully aware of the differences in the Democratic Party, on May 9 representatives of the old Whigs and Americans opened their convention at Baltimore, and nominated John Bell of Tennessee for President and Edward Everett of Massachusetts for Vice-President, on a platform of 'the Constitution of the Country, the Union of the States, and the enforcement of the laws.' Taking the name of the Constitutional Union Party it sought to gather to itself the conservative element wherever found, those who could not adopt the abolition views of the Republicans or the disunion sentiments of the Southern Democrats. Wholly respectable and well-meaning, it was a party of 'no idea and no purpose,' said the *Springfield Republican*. 'It might as well have taken the multiplication table and the decalogue for its platform as

the Constitution and the Union.'[1] Of little influence in the great political field, it did contribute to defeat Edward Bates at Chicago. The South through the seceding delegates, named John C. Breckinridge, then Vice-President, and Joseph Lane of Oregon as a third ticket in the field. Thus the Democrats entered the campaign crippled before the battle and divided beyond repair. Douglas had before him the greatest fight of his career.

The Republicans of Illinois held their State Convention at Decatur, May 9, four months after the meeting of the State Democrats and six days after the adjournment of the Charleston Convention. They had seen the difficulties of their opponents and their failure to arrive at even a working agreement for the State campaign. Long John Wentworth had opposed Judd for the governorship, but that incident was not allowed to disturb the even proceedings of the assembly. Naming Richard Yates for governor, the Convention instructed the delegates to the Chicago Convention to vote for Lincoln. Seven or eight of the delegates would gladly have gone for Seward, but there could be no doubt of the loyalty of the four delegates at large — Gustave Koerner, Norman B. Judd, Orville H. Browning, and David Davis. Much remained to be done in the ten days before the opportunity would be given to present Lincoln's name, and no more congenial task could be offered to the four leaders of the Illinois delegation. The doubtful States must be looked after, and States other than Illinois also had candidates, possibly with better claims than those of Lincoln. The call for Seward, too, was to all appearances overwhelming.

Seward had incurred the opposition of Republicans in Pennsylvania. His attacks on the Know-Nothings were remembered against him, and owing to the factional fight between Simon Cameron and Curtin, the nominee for governor, the Pennsylvania delegation to Chicago carried a candidate of its own — Cameron — while Curtin loudly asserted that the nomination of Seward would be the defeat of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania. From elsewhere came charges of inconsistency, of radical opinions on slavery, of inability to carry the doubtful States, of evil associations in politics. His long experience in public life had involved him in many controversies. The Republican minority in the Senate followed him as leader, confiding in his resourcefulness, with occasional doubts on his method. In spite of a strong undercurrent of opposition, in 1860 the party believed the nomination would be given to Seward and he confidently expected to receive it.

The real question about Seward was, as the *Boston Advertiser* said, 'not whether he is more moderate than the majority of his party,

[1] *Life and Times of Samuel Bowles:* George S. Merriam, I, 264.

but whether he is not more extreme than the majority.' [1] His speech in the Senate of February 29, 1860 — 'the coolest speech yet made in Congress' [2] — embodied his claims to the nomination. Its moderation displeased the more ardent, who compared it to Webster's Seventh of March speech, but gratified the conservatives. It was circulated by the thousands. 'The entire speech is as impassive as marble, and as bloodless as a corpse,' said the *Liberator*.[3] Worse still, Seward alienated the Germans, who could see little to choose between him and Bates on a conservative platform.[4] Greeley defended him and found no real contradiction between the Senate and the Rochester speeches, both of which said that liberty and slavery could not exist together and be at peace. In the struggle between them Seward hoped that Slavery would not triumph.

The Seward delegation and followers at Chicago had the best organization, untiring workers who showed no discouragement when met by widespread doubt on their candidate among the delegates of other States. If he did get the nomination, it was asked, could he win the election? Would he not alienate in every State voters who were essential to success — those fearful of his position on slavery, or Americans and old line Whigs, tenacious of their suspicions of radical leadership? To such objections answers were given without removing a sense that weighty obstacles to the eventual success of Seward must be faced. True, the opposition was unorganized and seemingly so divided as to make union on any one name out of the question. From this situation the Seward men drew hope.

Upon their arrival at Chicago the day before the Convention opened, the managers of Lincoln's candidacy sought to bring the opposition to Seward into a combination. Davis, Browning, and 'Tom' Marshall visited in turn the delegations from Maine and New Hampshire on the evening of the fifteenth, to urge their fears that Seward could not carry the Middle West. Accompanied by delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey they also called formally on the Massachusetts delegation, explained at length the political situation in Illinois and made a strong appeal for a man less objectionable than Seward. One of the Massachusetts delegates, Ensign H. Kellogg, proposed that each of the visiting delegations should name its preferences. Pennsylvania gave Cameron, Bates and McLean; Illinois, Lincoln, Cameron and Banks; and New Jersey, Dayton, Banks and Lincoln. As thus aligned the prospect of union on one name was not striking and Pennsylvania made no mention of Lincoln. These conferences, without result at the time, served a purpose. Davis and his associates proved their political sagacity. In spreading doubts on Seward, they

[1] *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 3, 1860. Editorial. [2] *Ib.*, March 1, 1860.

[3] *Liberator*, March 16, 1860.

[4] *Boston Pionier*, March 8, 1860.

were preparing to gather the unpledged or floating vote which in every convention awaits a turn to secure some advantage from the victor.

Aid came from others. Henry S. Lane, the Republican candidate for Governor of Indiana, said that with Seward, he and his party would inevitably be defeated, but with Bates, McLean, or Lincoln, they could sweep the State.[1] The German delegates held a meeting, to frame resolutions calling for a plank in the platform demanding perfect equality and protection to all citizens, at home or abroad, and declaring against any extension of the existing term of naturalization, and against any discrimination between native and adopted citizens as voters. They named Chase, Seward, and Lincoln, without expressing a preference, but a large number of Germans in the West leaned strongly to Lincoln. A committee acting in the interest of Bates issued an address giving reasons for nominating him, bearing the signatures of such as the veteran Francis P. Blair, Horace Greeley, and John D. Defrees. It failed of its purpose and produced a reaction in favor of Seward.

The Convention met on May 16 at noon in the Wigwam, a building specially constructed for it, capable of holding ten thousand persons comfortably and of admirable acoustic properties, long a matter of comment and wonder. The city was crowded, all hotels filled to capacity and groups gathered in the streets, exchanging the political talk usual at such times. Twenty-seven States had sent delegations and the Wigwam could accommodate only a fifth part of those wishing to enter. The Border States were represented, but none of the more Southern States except Texas. A call of the roll of the absent members of the Union was greeted with laughter and hisses. David Wilmot, temporary President, made a strong speech against slavery. In the afternoon George Ashmun was made permanent President, proved an excellent presiding officer, but in his speech avoided mention of the negro.

On the second day the platform was laid before the Convention and was adopted as a whole and without discussion. It denounced the Democratic Administration, the threats of disunion, and the 'lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext.' It denied the 'new dogma' that the Constitution, of its own force, carried slavery into the Territories of the United States, and also the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individual, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory, but was silent on a fugitive slave law. It called for a protective tariff, a complete and satisfactory homestead law, the maintenance of the existing naturalization laws, river and harbor appropriations,

[1] Correspondent New York *Tribune*, Chicago, May 14, 1860.

and government aid to construct a railroad to the Pacific Ocean. 'All the thousands of men in that enormous wigwam commenced swinging their hats, and cheering with intense enthusiasm, and the other thousands of ladies waved their handkerchiefs and clapped their hands. . . . As the great assemblage poured through the streets after adjournment, it seemed to electrify the city.' [1] Balloting would begin on the next day.

In these two days much had been done by the Illinois leaders and with surprising results. It has been seen that they conferred with the delegations of three New England States, and not a little had been learned of the sentiments in other States. The Ohio delegation was so divided as to hold out no hope of unanimity. The majority were for Chase, but a minority had expressed preference for Lincoln and McLean. Pennsylvania was instructed for Cameron, New Jersey for Dayton, and Missouri for Bates. A test of strength came on an attempt to require for a nomination a majority of the whole electoral college of the Union, which would include the votes assigned to States not represented in the Convention. The move originated among those opposed to Seward and was intended to prevent his nomination. By a vote of nearly four to one the proposed rule was defeated and a simple majority of the delegates voting in the Convention substituted for it. That seemed to favor Seward. Near midnight on the 17th, Greeley telegraphed to the New York *Tribune* that Seward would be nominated, and that was the general belief.

On the first ballot Seward received 173½ votes, Lincoln, 102, Cameron, 50½, Chase, 49, and Bates, 48, a result not far from what had been expected by the opponents of Seward. On the second trial Lincoln began to gain, two votes from New Hampshire, ten from Vermont, three from Rhode Island, two from Connecticut, when New York's unbroken seventy for Seward proved a check to the movement. Pennsylvania gave forty-eight to Lincoln and he won enough from other States to place him almost on an equality with Seward, and to indicate the decided trend in his favor. The totals showed 184½ for Seward, 181 for Lincoln, 35 for Bates, and 42½ for Chase. The third ballot proved decisive. Both Chase and Bates dropped out of the running and, with Seward at 180 votes and Lincoln at 231½, within one and one half of winning, it only remained for the yielding of that amount by a State to precipitate the final act of making the nomination unanimous. Ohio led the way and New York handsomely admitted the responsibility resting on the delegation. There was a moment's silence and then the storm broke. Within and without the building there were thousands cheering 'with the energy of insanity.' [2]

This discounts the usual explanation of the contest. Greeley's

[1] Halstead, *Caucuses of 1860*, 139–40.

[2] Halstead, 149.

influence in defeating Seward has been considered potent if not final. We have seen how he had favored Douglas against Lincoln in the senatorial contest of 1858, and on a visit to Illinois towards the end of December, Browning and others had told him some truths on the *Tribune's* 'benevolent attitude' toward Douglas. Four months later he did not believe that the anti-slavery men of the country had either the numbers or the sagacity to make a President. He would be willing to support either Seward or Chase on the platform of 1856, and would work for him 'with a will, but with perfect certainty that we are to be horribly beaten.' [1] Elated by the victories through fusion — the very policy Lincoln and his Republican associates in Illinois had rejected — victories in New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New Jersey, three of them doubtful States then and to be doubtful States in 1860 — his belief in his political prescience increased. Hence his readiness to support Edward Bates, who had never been a Republican, and whom he had never met or seen. Greeley thought Bates would get votes that no regular Republican could get — another fusion idea. Naturally Seward held a second place in his calculations.

Another motive had influenced him. Because of the dispute after the Convention, on Greeley's part in the result, there appeared on June 14 a petulant letter of Greeley, written six years earlier, in which he parted company with Thurlow Weed and Seward on the ground that they had been lukewarm in pushing his political ambitions. He had not, however, made public his personal opposition to Seward before joining with Blair and others in support of Bates. Weed held that Greeley should have given earlier notice of his hostility, but Greeley replied that it was through no fault of his that Seward was defeated. Henry J. Raymond, editor of the New York *Times*, gave an 'inside history' of the Convention and asserted that Greeley had been ten times more effective against Seward than 'the whole family of Blairs, together with all the gubernatorial candidates.' [2] The charge, good in a heated campaign, was hardly proved, though it could not be denied that the opposition of Greeley had made itself felt in the result. Raymond himself admitted that the nomination of Lincoln was 'purely an accident,' decided far more by the shouts and applause of the vast assemblage than by any direct labors of the delegates.[3]

There remains the charge that Lincoln secured the nomination through pledges made by Judge Davis to obtain the votes of Indiana and Pennsylvania. A delegation instructed to vote for one candidate must use its discretion in the Convention to transfer its support to another on discovering that its favorite has no chance of winning. Indiana had no candidate of its own and was believed to have a ma-

[1] Greeley to Baker, April 28, 1859. Weed, II, 255.

[2] Weed, II, 274. [3] *Ib.*, 273–4.

jority of its members favorable to Lincoln. Caleb B. Smith, a delegate at large from that State, seconded the nomination of Lincoln, and Indiana cast its full vote for him on the first ballot and made no change in the second and third. Henry S. Lane is represented as going from one caucus room to another, after midnight on the morning of the eighteenth, 'toiling with desperation to bring the Indiana delegation to go as a unit for Lincoln.' [1] Some weeks later Lincoln admitted to Smith that he was 'much indebted to Indiana; and, as my home friends tell me, much to you personally.' [2] There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Indiana vote was obtained by the promise of a cabinet appointment to Smith, but not enough to prove it.

With Pennsylvania the probability of such a promise becomes so strong as to be almost conclusive. From the factional fight in that State Simon Cameron had won the lead in the delegation to Chicago and an endorsement of his own candidacy for the Presidency, and from Pennsylvania came an insistent plea for a plank in the platform calling for a protective tariff. If that was obtained the Republican Party in Pennsylvania cared little who should be nominated at Chicago, but much for success at home. Leonard Swett, in an account of the acts of the Illinois leaders, wrote: 'The Seward men were laboring with delegates from that State [Pennsylvania], and so were friends of Mr. Lincoln, and both were hopeful; but in the small hours of Friday morning [the 18th], in a room of the Tremont House, two of Mr. Lincoln's friends and two of Mr. Cameron's being present, our arguments prevailed, and the Cameron men agreed to come to us on the second ballot. They did so right nobly.' [3] To Cameron was given a place in the Cabinet, a price that soon involved Lincoln in difficulties pregnant with disaster.[4]

Lincoln accepted the nomination and platform without reservation and, unlike Douglas, he took no part in the campaign. The vote in November gave Lincoln a victory which did not equal the high pitched estimates of eager party managers but which did give everything that could be needed. The popular vote for Lincoln was 1,866,452; for Douglas, 1,376,957; for Breckinridge, 849,781; and for Bell, 588,879. The fatal divisions in the Democratic Party, but for which it would have won a sweeping victory, placed the Republicans in power, on a strictly sectional basis of North against South. In

[1] Halstead, 142.

[2] Lincoln to Caleb B. Smith, May 26, 1860. *Works*, VI, 21.

[3] In Weed, II, 292. Koerner, II, 114, gives quite another story on Cameron's appointment.

[4] Early in January, 1861, George W. Julian went to Springfield to protest against admitting Smith and Cameron to the Cabinet. Lincoln admitted that the rumor of their appointment was true, but that he 'felt bound by the pledges which his leading friends had made in his name pending the National Convention.' *Political Recollections:* George W. Julian, 183.

1856 Buchanan had carried nineteen States and Frémont only eleven. Maryland stood alone in its loyalty to Fillmore. Two States — Minnesota and Oregon — with seven electoral votes were admitted before 1860, and both joined the Republican column. Lincoln carried eighteen Northern States, having one hundred and eighty electoral votes, Breckinridge, eleven Southern States, with seventy-two votes, and Bell, three Border States, with thirty-nine votes, almost reversing the relation of votes of 1856. Douglas had the nine votes of Missouri and three from New Jersey. Dearly had he paid for his rebellion against the administration and party discipline.

In such manner the course of events placed Lincoln in the highest place in the gift of the people of the North. Out of the tangle of policies, of parties and of their struggles, out of forty years of the approach of the slavery question to a crisis, stepped a man but little known beyond his own State, of little experience in public life, and of no experience as an executive. Described as a 'country lawyer,' an eloquent stump speaker, and a skilful politician, he possessed the engaging qualities of patience, frankness, honesty, and consistent caution which inspired confidence among the conservative, and it was the day of the conservative. The candidate of expediency, an 'accident' in gaining the place of standard-bearer, voted on by only a section of the country, and not winning a popular plurality, he stood quite alone. Knowing few of the leading public characters of the day, not possessing the unquestioning support of a large number of those who had voted for him, and, as a Black Republican, giving occasion to the secession of the South from the Union, he had need of the highest human qualities to meet the situation. His ignorance of the serious nature of the crisis was no greater than that of others better equipped and more experienced. He had mastered the principles underlying the dispute over slavery, but that dispute had produced a threat of rebellion. What of the future?

The story of the origin and development of this man has been told in these volumes. Out of the most unpromising materials — almost out of nothing — emerges a figure pathetic in its loneliness, inscrutable in its silences and reserves. Lincoln stands at the closed door of the future, armed by his party with instructions to prevent the extension of slavery, and to maintain inviolate the rights of the States, 'and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively.' There we leave him, about to undergo the supreme test of ruling a people in a time of civil war.

INDEX

INDEX

Abbott, Wilbur Cortez, III, 319 *n.*
'Abe,' use of, II, 238.
Abell, Bennett, I, 135 *n.*, 237 *n.*
Abell, Mrs. Bennett (Owens), I, 144, 145, 154, 156; II, 9.
Abolition, societies, I, 188; resolutions of Southern States, 189; Illinois on, 193, 247; Lovejoy murder, 226; movement, III, 18; confederates, 208.
Abolitionism, II, 170.
Abolitionists, Turner's insurrection, III, 17; number, 18; zeal, 18; morality of slavery, 21; position of slaves, 22; miscegenation, 23; runaway slaves, 26; fugitive slave law, 27; negro equality, 28; South on, 59; enemies to society, 65; Calhoun on, 89.
Abrams, Gordon, III, 158.
Ackerman, William Kelly, II, 298 *n.*
'Adam and Eve,' bridal hymn, I, 84.
Adams, Charles Francis, II, 170; nomination, 146 *n.*; Free-Soil Party, 167, 168 *n.*
Adams, James, II, 63 *n.*; controversy with Lincoln, I, 213, 227 *n.*
Adams, John Quincy, II, 111 *n.*, 126 *n.*, 140 *n.*; candidate for reëlection, I, 97; on Mrs. Royall, II, 105; in Congress, 109; Texas, 114, 117, 118; Lundy and, 117; on Douglas, 120 *n.*; death, 137.
Adams, Lucian, I, 217.
Addison, John, II, 195.
Address of Southern delegates, II, 187; III, 70.
Adjournment of session, dispute, I, 277.
Africa, moral redemption, I, 192; negroes in, III, 33, 48, 86; slave trade, IV, 222.
Agrarian movement, IV, 208.
Alabama, memorial on Abolitionists, I, 190; Nashville Convention, III, 121.
Alamo, massacre, II, 81.
Alexander, Jedidiah F., IV, 265 *n.*
Alien-voter, Ill., I, 294.
Allen, Charles, II, 170 *n.*; disunion, III, 76.
Allen, Charles, Armstrong trial, II, 267.
Allen, G. T., III, 288 *n.*
Allen, James Cameron, III, 273 *n.*
Allen, Robert, attack on Lincoln, I, 153.
Allen, William, I, 11 *n.*
Alley, Nelson, I, 119 *n.*; II, 203.
Alley, Samuel, I, 71 *n.*
Allison, John, IV, 36.
Almanac in Armstrong trial, II, 268, 273.
Alschuler, Sam, II, 206.
Alton, Ill., I, 175, 198; II, 197; IV, 45, 65; Shawneetown railroad, I, 198; Lovejoy affair, 219; commercial ambition, 221; convention at Upper, 223; abolition society, 223; debate at, IV, 329.
Amalgamation, I, 222 *n.*; III, 23 *n.*; IV, 145; Lincoln on, 152, 154.
Amboy, Ill., Lincoln at, IV, 294.
American Republican Party, III, 223.
'American Slavery as it is,' III, 22 *n.*
Americans, native, II, 71, 147.
Anderson, Joseph, I, 213, 218 *n.*
Anderson, Mary, I, 213.
Anderson, Richard, I, 213.
Anderson, Robert, I, 124 *n.*
Anderson Creek, Ind., I, 39 *n.*, 84.
Andrew, James Osgood, slave-holder, III, 57 *n.*
Andrew, John Albion, II, 169.
Angle, Paul McClelland, I, x; II, 22 *n.*
Anti-slavery, society in Illinois, I, 194.
Appeal of Independent Democrats, III, 184.
Appleton, William, III, 130 *n.*
Archer, William B., license bill, I, 269; Lincoln for vice-president, IV, 36.
Arkansas, III, 108.
Armstrong, Hannah, II, 9, 264 *n.*; on Lincoln, I, 137; Lincoln's liking for, 144; trial of son, II, 265, 272.
Armstrong, Jack, I, 137, 144; II, 265; leader of Clary Grove Boys, I, 110; fights Lincoln, 111; sergeant, 121.
Armstrong, John, II, 264 *n.*
Armstrong, William D. (Duff), trial of, II, 263; authorities, 263 *n.*; enlists, 272 *n.*
Arnold, Benedict, Lincoln and, II, 135.
Arnold, Isaac Newton, II, 280, 301 *n.*; Lincoln and Ann Rutledge, I, 152 *n.*
Asbury, Henry, question for Douglas, IV, 296.
Ash, William, I, 34 *n.*
Ashmore, Gideon M., II, 96.
Ashmore, Margaret, III, 67 *n.*
Ashmun, George, II, 111 *n.*, 131, 150, 177, 287; IV, 348; in Congress, II, 108; war with Mexico, 126, 131; IV, 316; platform, III, 150 *n.*
Atchison, David Rice, II, 110; III, 180, 330; Benton and, 171; pro-slavery, 303; Kansas, 309, 311; sack of Lawrence, 334.
Atchison, John, II, 258 *n.*
Atherton, John McDougal, I, 27; Lincoln cabin, 28 *n.*; Nancy Lincoln, 35 *n.*
Atherton's ferry, Knob Creek, Ky., I, 28 *n.*
Atlanta, Ill., IV, 254.
Atlas, Boston, II, 166 *n.*
Auctions, slave, III, 40, 47.
Audubon, John James, I, 18.
Audubon and Rozier, I, 18 *n.*
Augusta, Ill., Lincoln at, IV, 294.
Aurora, Ill., resolutions, IV, 286, 293, 305.
Austin, James Trecothick, defends Alton mob, I, 225.
Austin, Moses, Texan grants, II, 114.

Babcock, A. C., III, 286 *n.*
Badger, George Edmond, Nebraska bill, III, 180, 199 *n.*
Bailey, David, case against Cromwell, II, 98 *n.*
Bailey, Gamaliel, Jr., II, 105 *n.*
Bailey, Nathaniel, Etymological Dictionary, I, 21, 64 *n.*, 73.
Baker, Edward Dickinson, I, 124 *n.*, 247, 255 *n.*, 258, 273 *n.*, 274, 286; II, 45, 101, 131, 145, 194 *n.*, 196, 233 *n.*; described, I, 237; license bill, 269; Whig Junto, II, 5, 7; on Mrs. Browning, 9 *n.*; captain, 28; nominated for Congress, 62; elected, 66; to retire, 74; no bargain

with Hardin, 76; war with Mexico, 80, 94 *n.*; votes, 86 *n.*; plea for action, 120; for cabinet, 190; patronage, 191; disunion, III, 73.
Baker, Edward L., IV, 200 *n.*
Baker, Henry L., III, 288 *n.*
Balch, George B., II, 257 *n.*
Baldwin, Joseph Glover, 'Flush Times,' II, 222.
Ball of freedom, IV, 66.
Baltimore, union meeting, III, 119; Democratic conventions, 147; IV, 345; Whig Convention, 60.
Bancroft, George, at King's Mountain, IV, 55 *n.*
Banet *vs.* Alton & Sangamon R.R., II, 276 *n.*
Bank of the United States, history, I, 166, 232, 240; in Illinois Legislature, 168, 171, 184, 244, 281; Lincoln's speech, 258.
Banks, Nathaniel Prentiss, IV, 56.
Banks, State, Springfield, incorporated, I, 166; amend, 170; increase of capital, 198, 245; legislative examination, 200, 257; lobby, 202; failure, 203; report on, 203 *n.*; in difficulty, 232; suspension, 235, 276; requirements, 242; suspicions, 245; protected, 267; new law, 267, 270; resumption, 279, 280 *n.*; relief act, 287; failure, II, 37; notes not receivable, 38, 47.
Baptist Church, division, III, 57, 90.
'Barbara Allen,' I, 69.
Barbecue, on Douglas's plantation, III, 236 *n.*
Barn-burners, II, 147.
Barrens, the, Ky., I, 4.
Barret, Richard F., I, 273 *n.*; II, 21 *n.*
Barret, Sarah A. (Rickard), II, 21 *n.*
Barrett, George Johnson, Rev., II, 55 *n.*
Barrett, Oliver Rogers, collection, I, vii, 76 *n.*; II, 55 *n.*
Barry, B. F., IV, 276 *n.*
Bassett, Orville P., IV, 224 *n.*
Bates, Edward, II, 26; IV, 60; possible candidate, 341, 346, 348, 350.
Bath, Ill., Lincoln at, IV, 283 *n.*
Battery, the, II, 151.
Battle hymn, Democratic, III, 160.
Bay, Jens Christian, I, 83 *n.*
Bayard, James Asheton, IV, 26.
Beach, W., I, 97.
Beals, Clara (Leaton), II, 210 *n.*
'Bear Hunt,' Lincoln's verses, II, 88.
Beard, Charles Austin, I, viii.
Beardstown, Ill., II, 249, 265; Douglas and Lincoln at, IV, 282.
Bears and hogs, I, 44.
Beck, Mrs., II, 59.
Beckwith, Corydon, II, 303.
Beecher, Edward, Rev., II, 2; III, 137; sermon, I, 223; Lovejoy murder, 227; Galesburg debate, IV, 320 *n.*
Beecher, Henry Ward, I, 223 *n.*; III, 137; on Union, 133; Kansas, 330; Dred Scott decision, IV, 126.
Beecher, Lyman, I, 223 *n.*
Beechland, Ky., I, 17.
Beems and Arthur, II, 245 *n.*
Beers' Temperance Hotel, II, 104.
Bell, John, II, 110; Whig prospects, 166; on Douglas, III, 168; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 199 *n.*, 205; nominated, IV, 345.
Bell and Tinsley, II, 20 *n.*
Belleville, Ill., II, 93; III, 136; Lincoln at, IV, 71.
Bellmead plantation, Va., III, 45 *n.*
Beloit, Wis., IV, 65.
Bement, Ill., Douglas-Lincoln episode, IV, 272.
Benjamin, Judah Philip, IV, 203 *n.*
Benjamin, Reuben M., II, 252 *n.*, 276 *n.*
Bennett, John, I, 237 *n.*; II, 5, 60.
Benning, Henry L., III, 59 *n.*
Bently, Richard, motion, I, 276.
Benton, Thomas Hart, II, 90, 110, 138 *n.*; IV, 33, 126 *n.*; abolition prints, I, 189; Foote and, III, 91 *n.*; Atchison and, 171; Democratic Convention, IV, 25.
Bergen, Abram, II, 264 *n.*, 266, 274.
Berkeley, William, governor, III, 102.
Berry, Henry, Southern fears, III, 17 *n.*
Berry, Richard, I, 11 *n.*, 17.
Berry, William F., store of, I, 126.
Berry and Lincoln, I, 126; notes of, 127, 143 *n.*
Bethea, T. B., Nashville Convention, III, 121.
Bible, Thomas Lincoln's, I, 70; Abraham's reading of, 72; belief in, 138; slavery, III, 55; Beecher's, 330; Buford's company, 333 *n.*
Big Springs, Kas., III, 322.
Bigler, William, forced to retract, IV, 281, 313.
Biography, Lincoln on, II, 223.
Birch, Jonathan, on Lincoln, II, 226; admission to bar, 231.
Bird, Francis William, disunion, IV, 90.
Birney, James Gillespie, II, 181 *n.*; III, 110; candidate, I, 270; II, 71; 'American Churches,' III, 56 *n.*
Bishop, ——, III, 224.
Bissell, William Harrison, I, 290 *n.*; II, 84, 123; session adjournment, I, 278; war with Mexico, II, 80, 83; return, 93; compromise measures, III, 115; disunion, 116; Davis challenge, 116 *n.*; for Senate, 280; Governor, 359; IV, 7; Bloomington Convention, III, 360; IV, 17; elected, 80, 85.
Black, Chauncy Forward, II, 220 *n.*
Black, Jeremiah Sullivan, II, 220 *n.*
Black Hawk, I, 119, 120 *n.*
Black Hawk War, I, 119; II, 162.
Blackstone's Commentaries, I, 140.
Blackwell, Robert S., II, 294.
Blair, Francis Preston, IV, 348.
Blair, Francis Preston, Jr., IV, 33, 56.
Blair, Montgomery, Missouri Compromise, IV, 96; Dred Scott, 98.
Blaisdell, Frank Cutting, I, ix.
Blakely and Montgomery, I, 18 *n.*
Blanc, Louis, III, 65.
Blanchard, John, II, 107 *n.*
Bledsoe, Albert Taylor, II, 60; broadsword practice, 52.
Bliss, William Wallace Smith, III, 116 *n.*
Bloomington, Ill., II, 239, 288; Lincoln and Douglas at, III, 241; Convention, 1856, 355, 360; IV, 1, 195 *n.*; Hanks-Lincoln, 2; Major's Hall, 7; platform, 9; Douglas at, 250; Lincoln, 253.
Blow, Henry Taylor, IV, 96, 136.
Blow, Peter, IV, 93.
Boal, Robert, Lincoln's candidacy, II, 75; Lincoln-Douglas agreement, III, 271.
Boat building, I, 105.
Bogue, Vincent, captain, brings boat to Springfield, I, 118.
Bohne, Edward Henry, I, x.
Books, Lexington, Ky., I, 21; Sarah Lincoln's, 70; pioneer library, 70 *n.*; New Salem, 135; Vandalia, 176.

Boone, Daniel, in Kentucky, I, 8.
Boone, Ratliff, candidate, I, 98.
Boonville, Ind., licenses, I, 51 *n.*; size, 89.
Border Ruffians, III, 312, 336 *n.*
Borland, Solon, III, 91 *n.*
Boston, Mass., Lincoln in, II, 178.
Botts, John Minor, II, 186; Kansas-Nebraska bill, III, 200; Union speech, IV, 55 *n.*
Bourne, George, miscegenation, III, 24.
Boutwell, George Sewall, IV, 112.
Bowie, James, II, 81.
Bowman, Joseph G., license bill, I, 269.
Boyd, Linn, II, 189 *n.*
Brackenridge, John A., library, I, 77; impression on Lincoln, 90.
Bradford, John S., II, 212 *n.*
Brady, John T., II, 268 *n.*, 273.
Brayman, Mason, II, 290.
Brayton, B. B., II, 303.
Brayton, B. B., Jr., II, 303.
Breck, Daniel, Abolitionists, III, 118.
Breckinridge, John Cabell, vice-president, IV, 26; sectional rule, 54; Douglas opposes, 343; nominated, 346.
Breese, Sidney, I, 293; II, 233 *n.*, 298 *n.*, 300; III, 267; judge, I, 297 *n.*; decision in slave case, II, 99 *n.*; Lincoln's fairness, 245; for Senate, IV, 269.
Bremer, Fredrika, 'America in the Fifties,' III, 16 *n.*; masters of slaves, 37 *n.*; food of slaves, 39 *n.*; auction, 48 *n.*
Bright, Jesse David, IV, 57.
Bright, John, I, 3 *n.*
Broadwell, Norman McAlbin, II, 254 *n.*; III, 279 *n.*
Broderick, David Colbreth, IV, 178 *n.*
Brodnax, Henry P., I, 19 *n.*, 20 *n.*
Brooks, Preston Smith, described, III, 346; assault of Sumner, 347; IV, 67; a hero, III, 351; resigns, 352; challenges, 352 *n.*; on Frémont, IV, 54; song on, 63 *n.*; slavery, 259.
Brooner, Allen, I, 42 *n.*
Brooner, Henry, I, 48 *n.*
Brooner, Peter, I, 48.
Brooner, ——, on Nancy Hanks, I, 16 *n.*
Bross, William, IV, 193 *n.*, 304.
Brosseau, ——, II, 243.
Brother, Henry, I, 3 *n.*
Brown, Albert Gallatin, III, 115; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 199 *n.*, 202; Douglas's break with Buchanan, IV, 172.
Brown, G. O., Lincoln's religion, II, 242.
Brown, George T., IV, 193 *n.*, 227, 276 *n.*
Brown, John, at Lawrence, III, 327; murders by, IV, 42; defeat, 46; raid, 340.
Brown, Joseph Emerson, IV, 171 *n.*, 199 *n.*
Brown, Samuel, II, 258 *n.*
Brown, Uriah, liquid fire, II, 140.
Browne, J. Vincent, II, 149.
Browne, Thomas C., I, 177; Lincoln's wedding, II, 58.
Brownfield, George, I, 23 *n.*
Brownfield, William, I, 34 *n.*
Browning, Eliza (Caldwell), I, 180; Lincoln on Mary Owens, 156; invited to capital, II, 8; influence, 9 *n.*
Browning, Orville Hickman, I, 156, 165, 210, 258 *n.*; II, 233 *n.*, 294; III, 149 *n.*, 249 *n.*; described, I, 180; suit, II, 199; Bloomington Convention, IV, 6, 9, 19 *n.*; Dred Scott decision, 137; platform, 208; favors Bates, 341; Chicago Convention, 346.
Bryan, Edward B., IV, 214 *n.*
Bryant, Anthony, slave, II, 95, 100 *n.*
Bryant, Francis E., IV, 272.
Bryant, Jane, II, 95.
Bryant, John Howard, III, 356 *n.*; IV, 267 *n.*
Bryant, William Cullen, on Lincoln, I, 122; Springfield, 207.
Buchanan, James, II, 106, 157; IV, 308; nomination, 26; career, 27; Choate for, 52; on South, 55; bachelor, 66, 67; ten cents a day, 77; elected, 79; Dred Scott, 106; inauguration, 108, 134; political mistake, 109; Kansas, 164, 181; Lecompton Constitution, 167, 199; Douglas and, 173, 200, 330; party in Illinois, 297.
Buck Grove, Ill., Lincolns at, I, 108 *n.*
Buckmaster, ——, II, 245 *n.*
Buena Vista, battle of, II, 92.
Buckingham, James Silk, 'Slave States,' III, 6 *n.*; Charleston, 8; miscegenation, 24 *n.*; teaching of slaves, 37 *n.*; slave tasks, 39 *n.*; slave breeding, 47 *n.*; separation of families, 52 *n.*
Buffalo, N.Y., free Kansas convention, IV, 48.
Buford, Jefferson, Kansas company, III, 332; sack of Lawrence, 334.
Bullock, Alexander Hamilton, II, 172.
Bunn, Jacob, II, 200 *n.*, 252, 275; IV, 161.
Bunn, John Wheatfield, II, 257 *n.*, 308 *n.*
Burba, Erastus Reuben, I, 3 *n.*; estimate of Lincoln, 4 *n.*; credibility, 4 *n.*; on Thomas Lincoln, 5 *n.*, 6 *n.*, 35 *n.*; slaves in Hardin county, 13 *n.*; Lincoln's schools, 28 *n.*, 30; Thomas Lincoln's removal, 34 *n.*
Burke, Edmund, Life, II, 223; slavery, III, 5 *n.*; South, 60.
Burlingame, Anson, II, 169; IV, 56; Brooks's assault, III, 351; challenged, 352 *n.*
Burmeister, Hermann, on the negro, III, 35 *n.*
Burnet House, Cincinnati, II, 282.
Burnham, John Howard, II, 227 *n.*
Burns, Anthony, III, 219.
Burns, Robert, Lincoln's interest in, II, 3.
Burnside, Ambrose Everett, II, 299.
Burr, Aaron, I, 32.
Busey, Samuel Clagett, II, 107.
Bush, Christopher, I, 13, 17, 24 *n.*
Bush, Isaac, I, 13 *n.*, 24, 41, 58.
Bush, Sarah, I, 13 *n.*, 24 *n.*; asked by Thomas Lincoln, 17; marries Johnston, 17 *n.*
Butler, Andrew Pickens, Foote's resolution, III, 146; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 199 *n.*, 202.
Butler, Frances Anne (Kemble), III, 5 *n.* *See* Frances Kemble.
Butler, Pierce, III, 5 *n.*; Sumner's attack, 342, 344, 352.
Butler, Pierce [Mease], III, 5 *n.*
Butler, Speed, II, 58.
Butler, William, II, 19, 66; aids Lincoln, I, 209; to Mrs. Browning, II, 9; Sarah Rickard, 20; Lincoln-Shields affair, 48; challenged, 55.
Butler, William, of South Carolina, III, 146.
Butler, William Orlando, nomination, II, 143.
Butterfield, Justin, I, 293 *n.*; described, 177; Clay delegate, II, 145 *n.*; land commissioner, 192.
Byrne, J. B., IV, 175 *n.*
Byrne *vs.* Stout, II, 276 *n.*

Byron, George Noel Gordon Byron, Lord, Lincoln's interest, II, 3, 228.

Cabbage comparison, IV, 257.
Cabin, Lincoln, Kentucky, I, 3 *n.*; Illinois, 108 *n.*
Cadets of Temperance, III, 228 *n.*
Caldwell, Eliza, I, 180 *n.*
Calhoun, John, I, 258; III, 243 *n.*, 267; IV, 204; employs Lincoln, I, 132, 143; State banks, 242; abolition petitions, 248; clerk of house, 257, 276; Lincoln's land scheme, 270; example, III, 239; Kansas, 325; constitution, IV, 166, 180.
Calhoun, John Caldwell, I, 2 *n.*; II, 110, 138 *n.*, 150; III, 129, 152; Lincoln praises style, II, 5; letter to Pakenham, 118; address of Southern delegates, 187; III, 70; origin, 5; abolitionism, 20, 87; slavery, 33; centralization, 61, 63; Southern conservatism, 67; secession, 69, 91; equilibrium of States, 90, 104, 109, 114, 117; loss of influence, 92; hears Webster, 96, 100; death, 96 *n.*
California, II, 139 *n.*, 155 *n.*, 183; III, 71 *n.*, 79, 103, 108, 125, 199; IV, 79; migration, III, 166; slavery, 192, 247; Chinese, IV, 236.
Cambridge, Mass., Lincoln in, II, 114.
Cameron, John M., I, 109.
Cameron, Simon, II, 46; Chicago Convention, IV, 346, 351.
Camp, half-faced, I, 42.
Campbell, Charles Macfie, on Lincoln's mental trouble, II, 18 *n.*
Campbell, John Archibald, described, IV, 113; slaves, 116 *n.*; Scott decision, 122.
Campbell, Thomas, II, 73.
Campbell (Pendleton) County, Ky., I, 10 *n*
Campbellites and Baker, II, 63.
Canada, III, 51.
Canal, Illinois and Michigan, I, 171, 174, 178 *n.*, 196, 198, 266, 286, 290.
Canfield, Robert W., II, 73.
Canisius, Theodore, German press, IV, 265.
Capen, Charles L., II, 292, 295 *n.*
Capital, removal of, *see* Springfield.
Carleton, Ingalls, on debaters, IV, 297.
Carlin, Thomas, governor, I, 247, 256, 281, 293; II, 40 *n.*; financial policy defended, I, 239; State finances, 257, 276; bank notes, II, 38.
Carlisle, John M., II, 142.
Carman, Caleb, I, 135, 141, 143; on Lincoln, 106.
Carpenter, Milton, II, 40 *n.*
Carpenter, Samuel, I, 25 *n.*
Carter's tavern, Vandalia, I, 160 *n.*
Carter township, Ind., I, 47; population, 49 *n.*; politics, 96 *n.*
Cartwright, Peter, II, 33 *n.*; candidate for Congress, 84; Harrison murder case, 253; for Douglas, IV, 192.
Carusi's, Washington, II, 154.
Cass, Lewis, II, 110, 147 *n.*, 148, 173, 180 *n.*; II, 154 *n.*; III, 176, 181, 338 *n.*; nomination for president, II, 143; policy, 160; military service, 162; on slavery, 162; charges on treasury, 163; Sumner's speech, 46.
Cass County, II, 264 *n.*
Cassady, John, III, 267 *n.*
Cassell House, Decatur, III, 358.
Castle Garden, N.Y., III, 135.
Cathleen, rhyme on Shields, II, 47.
Caton, John Dean, II, 218, 221, 235 *n.*, 277; described, I, 177 *n.*; on lawyers, II, 233 *n.*; court gatherings, 237; Lincoln's fairness, 245; fees, 258 *n.*; advice to Trumbull, IV, 169 *n.*
Catron, John, Curtis's speech, IV, 103; suggestion, to Buchanan, 106; described, 112.
Cavour, Camillo Bensi di, Count, I, 3 *n.*
Centralization, fear of, III, 61.
Cerro Gordo, battle of, II, 94.
Chaddon *vs.* Beasly, II, 247 *n.*
Chaffee, Calvin Clifford, Dred Scott, IV, 94, 314; denies interest, 135.
Chambers, William, sale of children, III, 24; runaway slaves, 26; sale of slaves, 51 *n.*
Champaign County, II, 232, 242, 250.
Chandler, Zachariah, Supreme Court, IV, 202.
Channing, Edward, I, ix; III, 136 *n.*; IV, 91 *n.*, 95 *n.*; war with Mexico, II, 113 *n.*; Whittier's 'Ichabod,' III, 129 *n.*; emigrant societies, 301 *n.*; Kansas collections, IV, 20 *n.*
Channing, William Ellery, Lovejoy meeting, I, 225; Jamaica, III, 36.
Chapman, Augustus H., on Nancy Hanks, I, 16 *n.*; Thomas Lincoln, 66, 67; Intelligencer, 128 *n.*; marries, II, 208 *n.*
Chapman, Harriet A., II, 208 *n.*; on Sarah Lincoln, I, 59; Abraham's reading, 70; Lincoln's table, II, 214 *n.*
Charleston, Ill., debate at, IV, 311.
Charleston, S.C., society, III, 7; Buckingham on, 8; Murat, 8; Mackay, 8; Martineau, 9; Olmsted, 12; slave insurrection, 27 *n.*; convention, IV, 336, 344.
Charleston Mercury, III, 30.
Charters, as contracts, I, 170 *n.*
Chase, Lucien B., II, 137.
Chase, Philander, III, 110; on infidelity, I, 138 *n.*
Chase, Salmon Portland, III, 125, 239; IV, 33; described, III, 110; election to Senate, 110, 140, 210, 212; speech on compromise, 110; Free-Soil Convention, 156; appeal of Independent Democrats, 184, 210; Douglas's reply, 188; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 194, 211; IV, 217 *n.*, 301.
Cheever, George Barrell, sermon, IV, 128.
Chelsea, Mass., Lincoln in, II, 178.
Chevalier, Michel, on Richmond, III, 7; 'Society,' 7 *n.*; runaway slaves, 26; slavery, 42, 45 *n.*; increase of slaves, 43 *n.*; centralization, 62 *n.*; North and South, 65.
Cheves, Langdon, on Virginia, III, 144.
Chicago, II, 197, 232; bad financial condition, I, 143 *n.*; River and Harbor Convention, II, 89, 155; Lincoln speaks, 180; III, 272; Rock Island bridge, II, 302; fugitive slave law, III, 155; Douglas speaks, 155 *n.*, 231; shipping interests, 229; Kansas meeting, IV, 19; Republican banquet, 84; Convention, 1860, 346.
Chicago and Alton R.R., Lincoln's pass, II, 297.
Chicago, B. & Q. R.R. *vs.* Isaac G. Wilson, II, 277 *n.*
Chicago Times, established, III, 230.
Child, Lydia Maria, miscegenation, III, 24.
Chiniquy, Father Charles, trial, II, 242; Lincoln's religion, 243.
Choate, Rufus, II, 176, 177; III, 130 *n.*, 135; against Republican Party, IV, 51, 53.
Chrisman, John, Missourians and Kansas, III, 303 *n.*
Christian County, II, 6 *n.*
Christian Mirror, I, 222.
'Chronicles of Reuben,' I, 69 *n.*, 92.
Churches, divided on slavery, III, 57.

Cincinnati, II, 198 *n.*; Democratic Convention, IV, 25.
Circuit riders, I, 53; courts, II, 218, 233.
Circus, Lincoln at, I, 136.
Citizenship, negroes and, IV, 117.
Civilization and slavery, III, 33.
Clark, Henry, I, 113 *n.*
Clarke, Beverly L., II, 189 *n.*
Clary, John, I, 110.
Clary, Royal A., I, 121 *n.*
Clary, William, I, 111.
Clary Grove Boys, I, 110, 126, 138, 153; II, 265; wreck store, I, 127.
Clay, Cassius Marcellus, III, 239.
Clay, Henry, I, 2 *n.*, 172; II, 163; III, 78, 155, 176; IV, 290, 312, 333; speeches, I, 98; favored by Lincoln, 115, 137; bank, 167; set aside, 270; land bill, II, 61; nominated, 1844, 69; popularity, 69; faults, 71; war with Mexico, 125 *n.*; set aside, 144, 145, 146 *n.*, 161; Butterfield and, 192; slavery question, III, 13, 32 *n.*, 36; IV, 299; Abolitionists, III, 18, 20, 28; amalgamation, 26; severer laws on slaves, 30; disunion, 58, 80; compromise measures, 79, 125, 145, 178, 190; described, 79; speech, 79, 114, 120; higher law, 112; death, 150; Lincoln's oration, 151; repressing liberty, IV, 291 *n.*
Clay, James Brown, IV, 53.
Clayton, John Middleton, II, 145 *n.*; Lincoln's letter, 194.
Clemens, Jeremiah, disunion, III, 78; denounces Rhett, 147; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 199 *n.*, 201.
Clergymen, political workers, III, 222; Dred Scott decision, IV, 129.
Cleveland, II, 197 *n.*; disunion convention, IV, 162.
Clingman, Thomas Lanier, II, 111 *n.*
Clinton, DeWitt Co., Douglas and Lincoln at, IV, 280, 290.
Clinton County, II, 251, 255.
Cobb, Howell, II, 184 *n.*, 189 *n.*; Georgia platform, III, 144; Kansas, IV, 171 *n.*; on Douglas, 338, 341.
Cockle, John, IV, 19 *n.*
Cockrum, William Monroe, I, 48 *n.*
Codding, Ichabod, III, 239, 264 *n.*, 265, 266 *n.*, 276, 353, 356 *n.*; IV, 7, 29, 291.
Coffin, Rhoda M., I, 92 *n.*
Cogdale, Isaac, II, 254 *n.*; III, 271; Lincoln's religion, II, 4 *n.*
Colcock, William Ferguson, disunion, III, 74.
Cole, Arthur Charles, I, viii; IV, 227 *n.*, 267 *n.*
Coles, Edward, III, 192 *n.*
Coles County, Ill., Thomas Lincoln in, I, 108; II, 213 *n.*; Matson case, 95.
Colfax, Schuyler, II, 91; IV, 47.
Collamer, Jacob, Kansas, III, 337.
Colonization societies, I, 192; III, 13, 152, 249 *n.*; Webster on, I, 100; Lincoln, IV, 155.
Colquitt, Walter Terry, Nashville Convention, III, 121.
Columbus, II, 197 *n.*
Colvin, Aaron, I, 11 *n.*
Committee of the whole, I, 265 *n.*
Compromise of 1850. *See* Henry Clay.
'Congressional Globe,' III, 72.
Conkling, James Cook, IV, 41.
Connecticut, on Abolitionists, I, 191.
Conservative, the, IV, 55; on sectionalism, 58; Lincoln, 59.
Conspiracy, on slavery, IV, 133, 202, 256, 261, 282, 292, 301, 308, 313.
Constable, Charles H., II, 98, 99.
Constitution, amendment of, III, 90; slavery in, 96, 105, 261, 269; IV, 145; equality, III, 152; IV, 87, 117.
Constitutional Union Party, IV, 345.
Cook, Burton C., anti-Nebraskan, III, 279.
Cook, Isaac, IV, 197 *n.*, 226.
Cooking in New Salem, I, 146 *n.*
Cooper Institute speech, IV, 342.
Copeland, James, I, 243.
Corbin, Mary, II, 95, 97.
Corcoran, William Wilson, II, 106, 139 *n.*
Cords of Union, III, 89.
Corn shuckings, I, 54.
Corneau and Diller, II, 215 *n.*
Corporation, soul of, II, 254.
Corwin, Edward Samuel, IV, 126 *n.*, 131 *n.*
Corwin, Thomas, II, 90, 133, 144 *n.*, 150; III, 323 *n.*; claims of Texas, II, 121.
Corydon, Ind., I, 52.
Cotillion party, II, 8, 11.
Cotton, low price, II, 186; slavery and, III, 97.
Council Bluffs, Ia., III, 174.
Counterfeit Detector, II, 259.
Courts, county, II, 215, 243; Eighth Circuit, 216, 232; houses, 219.
Covode investigation, IV, 200 *n.*
Crafton, Greek, II, 253.
Crawford, Andrew, school of, I, 55, 64.
Crawford, Elizabeth (Mrs. Josiah), I, 76, 93 *n.*, 99; Abraham's dislike of work, 68; songs, 69, 84; religion, 72.
Crawford, George A., IV, 165 *n.*
Crawford, George Washington, II, 190 *n.*
Crawford, Josiah, I, 61, 65; books of, 76.
Crawford, S. A., I, 92 *n.*
Creal, Richard W., I, 23 *n.*
Crimes, North and South, III, 51.
Crisman, Isaac P., I, 131.
Crittenden, John Jordan, II, 110, 153 *n.*; III, 349; Taylor campaign, II, 144, 145 *n.*; dinner to, 150; on Lincoln, 190; repeal of Missouri Compromise, III, 199 *n.*; Lecompton Constitution, IV, 198, 232; favors Douglas, 278, 335.
Crockett, David, II, 81.
Cromwell, William, suit, II, 98 *n.*
Crume, Mary (Lincoln), I, 58 *n.*
Crume, Ralph, I, 58.
Crutcher, James, of Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 18 *n.*
Cuba, annexation, III, 248 *n.*; IV, 170; Ostend Manifesto, 31.
Cumberland Presbyterian Church, I, 109.
Cummings, Asa, I, 222 *n.*
Cunningham, Joseph Oscar, IV, 2, 6 *n.*, 19 *n.*
Curran, John Philpot, II, 100.
Currency, bad, I, 98.
Curtin, Andrew Gregg, IV, 346.
Curtis, Benjamin Robbins, III, 130 *n.*, 135, 220 *n.*; Dred Scott, IV, 99, 105, 107; described, 112; decision, 123.
Curtis, Charles Pelham, III, 130 *n.*
Curtis, George Ticknor, Dred Scott, IV, 101; on Taney, 115 *n.*; court, 130.
Cushing, Caleb, IV, 118, 345.
Cutts, Adele, marries Douglas, II, 107; IV, 175.
Cutts, James Madison, II, 107 *n.*; IV, 175 *n.*

Daggett, David, IV, 118 *n.*
Daimwood, Rebecca, II, 261.
Dalby, Joseph A., II, 277.
Dallas, Alexander James, I, 211 *n.*
Dana, Richard Henry, II, 169.
Daniel, Peter Vivian, described, IV, 112.
Danites, IV, 201, 228.
Danville, Ill., II, 236, 248, 262; IV, 65; show at, II, 238; Davis at, IV, 1.
Darwin, Charles, I, 2 *n.*
Davenport, Ia., II, 301.
David, William, I, 86.
Davidson, William H., I, 181.
Davies, John P., II, 256 *n.*
Davis, David, II, 206 *n.*, 224, 234, 260, 293; never invited by Lincoln, 213 *n.*; described, 216; on Lincoln, 218, 232; Lincoln's melancholy, 228 *n.*; eating, 235; orgmathorial court, 236; Lincoln's reticence, 241; religion, 242, 243; Lincoln as judge, 246; lawyer, 253; Lincoln's fee, 262; juries, 293 *n.*; Danville, IV, 1; Chicago Convention, 346.
Davis, Eliza, II, 22, 24, 33.
Davis, Garrett, III, 357 *n.*; war with Mexico, II, 119.
Davis, George Perrin, II, 216 *n.*
Davis, James, I, 11 *n.*
Davis, Jefferson, I, 124 *n.*; II, 150; III, 82 *n.*; IV, 201 *n.*; war with Mexico, II, 92; elected Senator, 111; on Baker, 190 *n.*; sectional division, III, 83; described, 83; love for Union, 86; challenges Bissell, 116 *n.*; Pacific Railroad, 170; ill, IV, 182 *n.*; slavery in Territories, 295 *n.*; in New England, 336; opposes Douglas, 337, 344.
Davis, John, II, 122.
Davis, Levi, I, 287; II, 38 *n.*, 57 *n.*
Davis, O. L., II, 262.
Dawson, John, I, 138, 154 *n.*; II, 8; motion, I, 173.
Dawson *vs.* Ennis, II, 308.
Dayton, William Lewis, nominated, IV, 36.
Dean, Joseph, II, 99.
Dearborn, Henry Alexander Scammell, II, 147 *n.*
Debates, Lincoln-Douglas, proposed, IV, 267; arranged, 271; press on, 274; character of, 274. *See* under each place.
DeBow, James Dunwoody Brownson, slavery, III, 42; 'Review,' on union, 69.
Decatur, Ill., I, 104; editors meet, III, 358; convention, IV, 346.
Declaration of Independence, equality clause, III, 21, 53; IV, 143, 152, 246, 319; a lie, III, 261; sacred, IV, 151.
Dedham, Mass., Lincoln in, II, 178.
Deitzler, George Washington, III, 315.
Delahay, Mark William, IV, 56, 195 *n.*; relations with Lincoln, III, 308; IV, 6, 48, 342; in Kansas, III, 308; Topeka Convention, 324; delegate, 328; in campaign, IV, 227.
Delano, Columbus, war with Mexico, II, 55.
Delaware, III, 109; disunion petition, 75.
Dement, John, I, 234.
Democrats, platform, 1844, II, 69; expansionists, 54; Convention, 1850, III, 147; Know-Nothings, 225; Springfield meeting, 266; defeat, 1854, 273; Convention, 1856, IV, 25; platform, 28; meetings, 69; split, 189, 296; Convention, 1858, 192, 201; national, 229; Conventions, 1860, 343, 345; disruption of party, 345.
Denham, ——, II, 245 *n.*
Dentists, for slaves, III, 38.
Detroit, II, 197 *n.*
Devan, Alexander, I, 53 *n.*
Dever, Oliver, I, 10.
DeWitt County, II, 298, 299.
Dew, Thomas Roderick, III, 18 *n.*; happiness of slaves, 41; slaves necessary, 46; breeding of slaves, 46; improvement of slaves, 49; time element, 59; centralization, 62.
Dewey, Chester P., IV, 310 *n.*
Dewey, Orville, III, 136.
De Witt, Alexander, III, 184 *n.*
Dickens, Charles, I, 3 *n.*, 26 *n.*
Dickerson, Edward M., II, 279.
Dickey, John, II, 107 *n.*
Dickey, Theophilus Lyle, Bloomington Convention, IV, 3; deserts Republicans, 194.
Dill, John T., complaint against Lincoln, I, 85.
Diller, Isaac R., II, 215.
Dirty hands case, II, 250.
Disraeli, Benjamin, I, 3 *n.*
District of Columbia, abolition of slavery, I, 191, 194, 248; III, 73, 104; IV, 299; slavery in, II, 103, 139, 183; III, 31, 71 *n.*, 125, 252; slaves taken from, II, 142; Lincoln's amendment, 184; slave trade, III, 79.
Disunion, sentiment of, III, 69; IV, 4, 333; Lincoln on, 17, 58, 80; Worcester convention, 89; Cleveland, 162.
Dixie, II, 239.
Dixon, Archibald, Missouri Compromise repeal, III, 173, 181; Douglas and, 181, 182.
Dixon, Joseph, I, 218 *n.*
Dodge, Augustus Cæsar, Nebraska, III, 175, 203, 204.
Dodge, Henry, II, 146 *n.*
Dodge, Mary Abigail (Gail Hamilton), II, 105 *n.*
Dodson, Jesse, I, 124.
Donaldson, William T., III, 311 *n.*
Donati's comet, IV, 310.
Donelson, Andrew Jackson, III, 184 *n.*, 357; IV, 21, 24.
Doolittle, James Reed, IV, 203 *n.*
Dorman, Rebecca (Daimwood), II, 261.
Dorman, Thomas Wilmer, III, 333 *n.*
Dorman, William M., II, 261.
Dorman *vs.* Lane, II, 261 *n.*
Dorscheimer, Philip, IV, 35.
Dorsey, Azel W., school, I, 56 *n.*, 62, 64.
Dougherty, John, IV, 229.
Douglas, Adele (Cutts), marriage, IV, 175; presence, 178; illness, 182 *n.*; in campaign, 249, 277; White on, 283.
Douglas, John M., II, 292, 295 *n.*, 299.
Douglas, Martha Denny (Martin), death, III, 165.
Douglas, Stephen Arnold, I, 171 *n.*, 182, 184 *n.*, 218, 258, 261, 264, 272, 293 *n.*; II, 8 *n.*, 39, 85, 110, 276 *n.*, 301; III, 295; IV, 10 *n.*; State's attorney, III, 165; favors conventions, 172; described, 181; IV, 297; 'Little Giant,' I, 182; dances, 183; defends Jackson, 186; railroad plans, 196; II, 140, 287; internal improvements, I, 198 *n.*, 236; bank examination, 203 *n.*; toast, 211 *n.*; influence on Illinois Republican, 212; register, Land Office, 237 *n.*; defeated by Stuart, 255; carries Illinois for Van Buren, 275; Secretary of State, 294; Supreme Court, Ill.,

295; judge, 297 *n.*; no teller of stories, II, 2; Mary Todd, 13, 17 *n.*; Matilda Edwards, 13 *n.*; votes, 86 *n.*; elected to Senate, 89; marries Adele Cutts, 107; war with Mexico, 119, 134; success, 196; offers liquor to Lincoln, 236; disunion petition, III, 75 *n.*; leader of party, 106; the West, 106; popular sovereignty, 107; Wilmot proviso, 107; Territories and slavery, 108, 176; Fugitive Slave Law, 109; abolitionism, 109; Baltimore Convention, 148; Richmond speech, 153; Chicago speech, 155 *n.*; Lincoln's reply, 154; slavery speech, 162; marriage, 165; visits Europe, 165; program, 165; slaveholdings, 165 *n.*, 235, 281 *n.*; presidency, 166; organizer of Territories, 168, 205, 206; Pacific Railroad, 169, 176; Atchison and, 173; popular sovereignty, 177, 255; IV, 140, 232, 237, 240, 323; Nebraska, III, 177; section of bill, 179, 252; Dixon and, 181, 182; attacked in appeal, 186; speech on bill, 188, 206; warning of division, 196; question of success, 201 *n.*; ministers' protest, 221; Philadelphia speech, 226; against Know-Nothings, 226; Harbor bill, 230; hostility to, 230; speech and repulse, 231; false announcements, 233 *n.*; Kansas-Nebraska campaign, 234; Bloomington speeches, 241; IV, 250; Springfield speeches, III, 242; IV, 255; Cuba, etc., III, 248 *n.*; reply to Lincoln, 262; morality of slavery, 269; IV, 243, 317; speaking agreement with Lincoln, III, 270; on election, 1854, 273; sensational campaign, 277; to Lanphier, 280; land speculation, 281 *n.*; report on Kansas, 337; Kansas constitution, 338; IV, 140, 231, 241; Sumner's attack, III, 342; reply, 343; speeches, 1856, 355; IV, 47 *n.*; Lincoln on, 15; Cincinnati Convention, 25; campaigning, 69; Chicago speech, 1857, 139, 146; Utah, 140; courts and Dred Scott, 141, 150, 251; negro equality, 143, 236, 251, 256; attacked and defended, 147; break with Buchanan, 164, 167, 172, 174, 330; marriage, 175; speech in opposition, 178, 182; Republican opposition, 185; on Lincoln, 188, 211, 232; outside aid, 196; political deal, 197; English bill, 200; dead lion, 222, 224, 239; denounces plot, 228; Chicago return, 1858, 230; speech, 231; uniform laws, 233; Supreme Court, 234, 244, 251; South and, 248; campaigning luxuries, 249; the conspiracy, 256, 282, 292, 301, 308, 313; debates arranged, 268; Bement episode, 272; contrast to Lincoln, 275; opposition to, 276; Trumbull's charge, 281, 287, 313; at Ottawa, 284; Lincoln's youth, 286; at Freeport, 297; new territory, 303; willing for test, 307; at Jonesboro, 311; at Charleston, 313; nationalizing slavery, 318; at Galesburg, 319; Beecher on, 320 *n.*; at Quincy, 321; Schurz on, 326; at Alton, 329; elected, 334; in Charleston Convention, 336, 343; Davis and, 337; decline of his influence, 337; in Ohio, 339; Brown's raid, 340; in Baltimore Convention, 345; nominated, 345.

Douglas, Mrs., miscegenation, III, 24 *n.*

Douglas, Kas., resolution, III, 302 *n.*

Douglas, Frederick, III, 137 *n.*; IV, 293; sale of slaves, III, 23; slave insurrections, 27; Dred Scott decision, IV, 133; at Freeport, 303.

Dow, Jesse E., II, 186 *n.*

Downs, William, Rev., I, 36.

Doyle, John P., murder of, IV, 43.

Drake, Daniel, Kentucky weddings, I, 17 *n.*; quilting bees, 55 *n.*; Lincoln consults, II, 15; slaves, III, 143 *n.*

Drayton, Daniel, II, 142.

Dresser, Charles, Rev., Lincoln's wedding, II, 58; sells house to Lincoln, 68.

Dresser, Thomas Withers, Mrs. Lincoln's temper, II, 59.

Drivers of slaves, III, 38 *n.*

Drummond, Thomas, II, 208, 279, 284, 301; Lincoln's fairness, 246.

Dubois, Jesse Kilgore, IV, 161, 163 *n.*, 177 *n.*, 212, 262 *n.*; described, I, 179; auditor, II, 299; Bloomington Convention, III, 3, 7, 8 *n.*, 18.

Dubois, Lincoln, I, 179 *n.*

Duchesne, Madame, I, 88.

Dudevant, Armantine Lucile Aurore (George Sand,) III, 138.

Duels, II, 43 *n.*; Lincoln on, 48; punishment, 54.

Duer, William, III, 73.

Dummer, Henry Enoch, I, 209; Lincoln's candidacy, II, 74.

Dunbar, Alexander P., I, 165 *n.*

Dunbar, Charles Franklin, IV, 163 *n.*

Duncan, Jason, I, 112, 131, 134, 140 *n.*, 141.

Duncan, John, Rev., I, 29 *n.*

Duncan, Joseph, I, 126 *n.*, 170, 199; governor, 163 *n.*; on Jackson, 184, 233; change of party, 184; Southern resolutions, 189; internal improvements, 138; national politics, 238.

Dungey *vs.* Spencer, II, 257 *n.*

Dunklin, Daniel, I, 130.

Dunlap, James, II, 14 *n.*

Dunlap, Sarah, II, 14 *n.*

Dunlap *vs.* Smith, II, 276 *n.*

Dunn, George G., Kansas bill, III, 338.

Dupree, ——, song book, I, 72.

DuPuy, ——, II, 292 *n.*

Dye, Job, I, 34 *n.*

Earle, Thomas, I, 270.

Early, Jacob M., captain, I, 123.

Eastman, Zebina, III, 19 *n.*, 266.

Eddy, F. M., II, 261 *n.*

Edgeworth, Maria, 'Belinda,' III, 26.

Edmundston, Henry Alonzo, III, 347, 351.

Edwards, Benjamin, II, 290.

Edwards, Benjamin S., IV, 255.

Edwards, Cyrus, I, 178, 180, 296; II, 10, 13 *n.*, 193; III, 285; Lovejoy affair, I, 223; defies doorkeeper, 278; candidate for U.S. Senate, 286; Land Office, II, 192, 194.

Edwards, Elizabeth Parker (Todd), II, 36, 37, 248 *n.*; on Mary Todd, 11, 12, 13, 17; warnings, 15, 17; Lincoln's wedding feast, 16; gloom, 18; marriage of Lincoln, 58; Lincoln's abstraction, 209.

Edwards, Henry, II, 256 *n.*

Edwards, Jonathan, slave-holder, III, 55.

Edwards, Matilda, II, 13 *n.*

Edwards, Ninian, governor, I, 19 *n.*; II, 10.

Edwards, Ninian Wirt, I, 153, 154 *n.*, 165, 278; II, 8 *n.*, 56, 248; III, 287; described, I, 178; sketch, II, 10; opinion of Lincoln, 13; Lincoln's gloom, 17.

Edwards family, I, 178; II, 9.

Edwardsville, Ill., I, 108.

Effie Afton, II, 301.

Effingham, Ill., II, 249.

Egan, McIllroy, III, 360; IV, 19.

Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 12, 13, 17, 42; description,

18; lawyers, 19; school, 19; religion, 19; Johnston lot, 95.
Elkin, David, I, 49.
Elkin, William F., I, 154 *n.*
Elliot, Charles, on Methodist schism, III, 57 *n.*
Ellis, Abner Yates, I, 135; Pappsville speech, 125 *n.*; store of, 131; postmaster and Lincoln, II, 211 *n.*
Eloquence, Lincoln's, II, 5.
Emancipation, II, 187; III, 16, 18, 32, 57, 250.
Embree, Elisha, II, 107 *n.*, 193.
Emerson, John, owner of Dred Scott, III, 93, 124.
Emerson, Mrs. John, IV, 93, 94; remarriage, 94.
Emerson, Ralph, reaper case, II, 283.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, II, 170 *n.*; on Sumner, III, 342.
Emery, James Stanley, IV, 11.
Emigrant aid societies, III, 258, 301, 319; congressional, 302 *n.*; companies sent, 304; blamed, 310, 323 *n.*, 340; losses, 335.
Emmerson, Henry, II, 203.
Emmet, Robert, IV, 30.
Emmons, Halmer Hull, II, 279 *n.*
Emmons, Sylvester, II, 74 *n.*
England, Southern slavery, III, 33; solicitude for blacks, 36; laborers in, 44.
English, Revill W., I, 243; Lincoln-Shields affair, II, 55.
English, William Hayden, bill, IV, 199.
English, ——, IV, 227.
Enos, Pascal Paoli, II, 147 *n.*; III, 267 *n.*
Enquiry, the, II, 228.
Equality, in declaration, III, 21, 53; IV, 143, 152, 246, 319; diversity and, III, 54; in constitution, 152; IV, 87, 117; negro, 235, 261, 312.
Erable, l', Ill., II, 242.
Esarey, Logan, I, 54, 57 *n.*
Euclid, Lincoln studies, II, 221.
Eufaula, Ala., III, 332.
Evansville, Ind., I, 89.
Everett, Edward, I, 129; II, 180 *n.*; IV, 165 *n.*; nominated, 345.
Everett, ——, II, 34 *n.*
Ewing, James S., II, 293, 294 *n.*; IV, 268 *n.*
Ewing, William Lee Davidson, II, 53; on criminal code, I, 163; removal of capital, 234; described, 234; denounces Lincoln, 235; speaker, 238, 276; Lincoln-Shields affair, III, 352.
Expansion, instinct for, I, 9; II, 66.

Fairfield, John, on Washington, II, 106.
Faneuil Hall, Boston, Lovejoy meeting, I, 225; Sumner in, II, 168; III, 132; Webster meeting, 135.
Farmer, Aaron, I, 82.
Farmers, small, in the South, III, 5; and mechanics, education, 229 *n.*; movement, IV, 208 *n.*
Farmington, Ky., II, 21 *n.*, 22.
Farrar, Timothy, IV, 126 *n.*
Farwell, Mrs. Walter, I, x.
Faux, William, I, 44 *n.*, 47 *n.*, 51 *n.*, 52 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 54 *n.*, 57 *n.*, 60 *n.*, 98 *n.*
Fayette county, Ky., II, 184.
Fees, lawyer's, II, 255.
Fell, Jesse W., Lincoln's religion, II, 242; Lincoln and, III, 294; prohibition, 294 *n.*; joint debates, IV, 267.
Felton, Cornelius Conway, III, 130 *n.*
Ferrel, ——, I, 51 *n.*
Fesler, James William, I, ix.
Fessenden, William Pitt, conspiracy, IV, 203.
Ficklin, Orlando Bell, II, 276 *n.*, 298 *n.*; on Dennis Hanks, I, 30 *n.*; described, 179; seat of government, 245; bank investigation, 257; Matson case, II, 96, 99; at Charleston debate, IV, 315.
Field, Alexander, secretary of state, III, 293.
Field, David Dudley, II, 91.
Field, Roswell M., IV, 95; Missouri Compromise, 96.
Fighting, prevalence of, I, 52, 110 *n.*, 112 *n.*, 138.
Fillmore, Millard, III, 149; IV, 21, 41, 42, 64 *n.*; vice-president, II, 145; Webster and, III, 128; in Springfield, 238; nominated, 357; IV, 61; career, 24; sectionalism, 50; defeated, 79.
Filson, John, Boone's autobiography, I, 8 *n.*
Fire-eaters, Southern, III, 20; IV, 54.
Fish, Stuyvesant, II, 296 *n.*
Fisher, Sidney George, 'Laws of Race,' III, 35 *n.*; slavery question, 58 *n.*; Southern rights, 59 *n.*
Fisk, Wilbur, III, 56.
Fitzhugh, George, 'Sociology,' III, 31; IV, 13, 77; slavery and peonage, III, 32 *n.*, 35; Southerner and slave, 51; on Hagar, 55 *n.*; marriage, 64 *n.*
Flournoy, Thomas Stanhope, young Indian, II, 136 *n.*
Floyd, John, Turner's insurrection, III, 17.
Floyd, John Buchanan, IV, 172 *n.*
Floyd's Fork, Ky., I, 9 *n.*, 10, 11 *n.*
Foote, Henry Stuart, III, 82, 94, 125; disunion, 91; affrays, 91 *n.*; compromise finality, 145.
Foote, Samuel Augustus, resolution, I, 101.
Ford, Thomas, I, 256; II, 6, 53, 84, 233 *n.*; on Black Hawk War, I, 120; bank bill, 166 *n.*; internal improvements, 197, 199; bank investigations, 204; capital at Springfield, 205; on Lovejoy, 222 *n.*, 223, 224 *n.*; repudiation, 287; governor, 287 *n.*; judge, 297 *n.*
Ford, Thomas H., III, 357 *n.*
Fordham, Elias Pym, I, 38, 52 *n.*
Forney, John Weiss, IV, 211.
Forquer, George, I, 119 *n.*, 237 *n.*; answers Lincoln, 153.
Forrest, memorial, I, 95 *n.*
Fort Leavenworth, III, 333.
Fort Riley, Kas., III, 308.
Fort Wayne, II, 197 *n.*
Fortune, William, I, 83 *n.*
Foss, Robert Harris, III, 286 *n.*
Foster, Stephen Symonds, Methodist Church, III, 24; slavery, 134.
Fowler, Orin, II, 171 *n.*
France, socialism, III, 64.
Francis, Simeon, I, 273 *n.*; II, 36, 48, 74; relations with Lincoln, I, 212; public printer, 291; Lincoln's temperance address, II, 33; secretary of Oregon, 195.
Francis, Mrs. Simeon, Lincoln's courtship of Mary Todd, II, 36, 57.
Free-Soilers, Utica Convention, II, 146; platform, 146 *n.*; in Massachusetts, 167; Worcester Convention, 1848, 168; Lincoln on, 173; Pittsburgh Convention, III, 156; defeat, 163.
Freedmen, III, 16, 50, 57; votes, 58.
Freeman's Song, III, 301.
Freeport, Ill., III, 219 *n.*; doctrine, IV, 143, 302, 337, 339; question at, 289; debate at, 294.
Frémont, Jessie Benton, IV, 67.

Frémont, John Charles, II, 139 *n.*, 155 *n.*; nominated, III, 357; IV, 33; Lincoln's dislike, 34, 39; campaign songs, 63; meetings, 65; origin, 68; woolly horse, 76; defeat, 79; Garrison on, 89 *n.*
Friend, Caty, I, 37 *n.*
Friend, Charles, I, 15 *n.*, 16 *n.*; Lincoln's schools, 28 *n.*
Friend, Isaac, I, 37 *n.*
Friend, Jesse, I, 37 *n.*
Friend, Mary (Hanks), I, 37 *n.*
Fry, Joshua, II, 12 *n.*
Fry, Lucy Gilmer, II, 12 *n.*
Fuller, Samuel W., II, 301 *n.*
Fullerton, Hugh, II, 263 *n.*, 265.
Furgeson, James, of Hardin Co., Ky., I, 20 *n.*

Gabriel, negro, III, 27 *n.*
Gage, ——, IV, 195.
Galena, lead purchases, I, 245; Lincoln at, IV, 57.
Galesburg, Ill., debate at, IV, 316; Beecher on, 320 *n.*
Gamble, Hamilton Rowan, Dred Scott case, IV, 94.
Game, in Indiana, I, 60 *n.*
Gander pulling, I, 113 *n.*
Gardner, Henry Joseph, Lincoln in Massachusetts, II, 175 *n.*, 177 *n.*
Garland, Hugh A., IV, 95.
Garland, James M., II, 200 *n.*
Garrard, James, I, 9.
Garrison, William Lloyd, II, 169 *n.*, 170; III, 19 *n.*; IV, 162 *n.*; liberator begins, I, 188; address to free people of color, 188 *n.*; Lovejoy affair, 225 *n.*; opposes Birney, II, 71 *n.*; position, III, 20; on Bourne, 25 *n.*; union and slavery, 28; IV, 89; infidel, III, 49; Webster, 129; Fugitive Slave Law, 132; Thayer's scheme, 300.
Gatewood, William, I, 296 *n.*
Geary, John White, governor of Kansas, IV, 61.
Geiger House, IV, 284.
'Genius of Universal Emancipation,' Lundy's, II, 100 *n.*; III, 20 *n.*
Gentry, Allen, New Orleans journey, I, 87, 107.
Gentry, Anna C. (Roby), I, 63.
Gentry, James, I, 61, 80, 93 *n.*; at Gentryville, 86; New Orleans venture, 87; buys Lincoln's land, 95.
Gentry, Joseph, I, 93 *n.*
Gentry, Matthew, II, 87.
Gentryville, I, 86, 102; II, 2, 71; Lincoln's verses, 87.
Geoghegan, Ambrose, of Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 22 *n.*
Geoghegan, Denton, suit with Thomas Lincoln, I, 22.
Georgetown, D.C., II, 102, 172, 183.
Georgia, abducted slave, I, 247; slave crimes, 51 *n.*; resolutions, 93; platform, III, 144.
Georgia, poem, III, 63 *n.*
Germans, prohibition and slavery, III, 228, 294; IV, 66; population, III, 294 *n.*; Bloomington platform, IV, 10; Republican platform, 33; safe in Republican Party, 49; appeal to, 242, 245; at Chicago, 348.
Geyer, Henry Sheffie, IV, 98.
Giddings, Joshua Reed, II, 107 *n.*, 131, 133, 170, 184 *n.*; III, 19 *n.*, 125, 184 *n.*, 224, 239, 353; IV, 29, 56; in Congress, II, 108; war with Mexico, 121, 126 *n.*, 127; *Pearl* inquiry, 142; on slavery, 184; disunion, IV, 91.
Gihon, John H., IV, 42 *n.*, 44 *n.*, 46 *n.*
Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau, States' rights, III, 63; Abolitionists, 65.
Gill, Jonathan, II, 265 *n.*
Gill, Ruth A., II, 265 *n.*
Gillespie, Joseph, II, 225, 252 *n.*, 256; III, 149 *n.*, 358; IV, 41, 95 *n.*; special session's adjournment, I, 280 *n.*; Lincoln's memory, II, 3; Butterfield's appointment, 193; Lincoln's children, 208; intimacy with Lincoln, 219; Lincoln on history, 223; fatalism, 230; stories, 234; eating, 235; temperance, 236; coldness, 238 *n.*; character, 240; fairness, 245; Lincoln's mind, 275; absence of envy, 284; campaign letter, III, 277; senatorial contest, 285, 287; IV, 21; doubts, 21; Republican, 265.
Gilman, William, II, 96.
Gladstone, Thomas H., III, 336 *n.*
Gladstone, William Ewart, I, 3 *n.*
Globe Tavern, Springfield, II, 59, 66.
Glover, Joseph Otis, IV, 284.
Gobin, Clara (Leaton Beals), II, 210 *n.*
Gobin, Hilary Asbury, II, 210 *n.*
Godbey, Russell B., I, 106, 126 *n.*, 139.
Godkin, Edwin Lawrence, IV, 276 *n.*
Goliad, massacre, II, 81.
Gollaher, Austin, I, 27 *n.*, 29 *n.*, 30 *n.*, 31.
Good Samaritans, III, 228 *n.*
Goodrich, Grant, II, 201, 277 *n.*, 294.
Goose Nest Prairie, Ill., Thomas Lincoln at, I, 108 *n.*
Gordon, Nina, III, 29 *n.*
Gott, Daniel, resolution, II, 184.
Gourley, James, rose bushes, II, 204; Mrs. Lincoln, 214 *n.*; Lincoln's religion, 242; carriage, 308 *n.*
Government by all the people, III, 131.
Graham, Christopher Columbus, on Thomas Lincoln's marriage, I, 17 *n.*
Graham, Mentor, I, 144; election at New Salem, 109; aids Lincoln, 116, 132; on Lincoln's study, 133; character, 142; on Mary Owens, 145 *n.*; Ann Rutledge, 146 *n.*; Lincoln's grief, 150 *n.*
Graham, Samuel, I, 60 *n.*
Graham, William Alexander, III, 149.
Grant, I. M., IV, 276 *n.*
Grant, Ulysses Simpson, I, 2 *n.*; II, 94, 299.
Gray, Horace, Jr., IV, 126 *n.*
Gray, ——, III, 285 *n.*
Grayson, William John, III, 46 *n.*, 49 *n.*
Greathouse, Jonathan, I, 50 *n.*
Greeley, Horace, II, 144 *n.*, 147 *n.*, 184 *n.*; III, 19 *n.*, 153 *n.*, 224; IV, 36, 197, 211, 267; Chicago Convention, II, 89; Lincoln on boundary, 151; Baltimore Convention, III, 148 *n.*; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 217; North, 218; Illinois senatorial contest, 290; liquor law, 293 *n.*; Kansas election, 310; Border Ruffians, 312; on Shannon, 325; Kansas troubles, IV, 46; Kansas clubs, 49; sectional party, 53; Worcester Convention, 91; Supreme Court, 99; Scott decision, 125; advises Douglas, 177; praises him, 184, 188, 193, 196 *n.*, 224, 231; Lincoln on, 187; break with Seward, 197, 350; aids Lincoln, 262; Chicago Convention, 348, 349.
Green, Bowling, I, 137, 237 *n.*; II, 5, 9; interest

in Lincoln, I, 141, 151; wife of, 144, 155; regret for, II, 6 *n.*; death, 27.
Green, Duff, of Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 18 *n.*; Butterfield appointment, II, 193.
Green, Johnson G., on Mary Owens, I, 145.
Green, William, I, 150 *n.*
Green River, Ky., I, 9, 10.
Greene, E. S., II, 256 *n.*
Greene, William G., I, 78, 134, 143 *n.*; at Thomas Lincoln's, 108 *n.*; clerk, 127; debt of, 143 *n.*; II, 203 *n.*
Greenwood, Grace, II, 105.
Gregory, Dudley S., II, 152 *n.*
Greusel, Joseph, II, 288.
Gridley, Asahel, I, 280 *n.*
Gridley, J. N., II, 264 *n.*
Grier, Robert Cooper, Dred Scott, IV, 106; letter to Buchanan, 107; described, 113.
Grigsby, Aaron, I, 91; marriage, 84.
Grigsby, Charles, marriage, I, 92.
Grigsby, Nancy, I, 96.
Grigsby, Nathaniel, I, 83, 96 *n.*; on Thomas Lincoln, 5 *n.*, 67; Nancy Hanks, 16, 16 *n.*, 17 *n.*; death of Nancy Lincoln, 48 *n.*; Crawford's school, 56; Abraham at school, 62, 63, 64; Abraham's friendliness, 67; songs, 68; religion, 71; jokes, 80, 83; speeches, 81; 'Chronicles of Reuben,' 92 *n.*; Lincoln's fight, 94.
Grigsby, Redmond, I, 93 *n.*
Grigsby, Reuben, I, 92.
Grigsby, Reuben, Jr., marriage, I, 92.
Grigsby, Sarah (Lincoln), marriage, I, 84; death, 91.
Grigsby, William, satire on, I, 93.
Grimes, William, IV, 41.
Grimshaw, William, 'History of the United States,' I, 73.
Groceries, I, 269.
Grund, Francis Joseph, abolition, III, 36.
Grundy, Felix, I, 19 *n.*; warning, 189.
Guadalupe Hidalgo, treaty, II, 130 *n.*
Guilford, Joshua, IV, 276 *n.*
Gum, Jacob, I, 10.
Gunther, Charles Frederick, II, 274 *n.*
Guthrie, Abelard, III, 175 *n.*, 307 *n.*
Guthrie, Quindaro, III, 307 *n.*
Gwin, William McKendree, Pacific Railroad, III, 170 *n.*
Gypsy, IV, 93.

Haines, James, II, 231.
Haiti, III, 36, 47.
Hale, Albert, Rev., on war with Mexico, II, 93.
Hale, Edward Everett, Kansas, III, 300 *n.*
Hale, John Parker, II, 110; IV, 56; disunion petition, III, 75; compromise, 125; Free-Soil Convention, 156; labor vote, IV, 77; Dred Scott decision, 137, 202.
Hall, James, I, 3 *n.*
Hall, Levi, I, 21 *n.*; Nancy Hanks and, 15 *n.*; moves to Indiana, 73.
Hall, Levi, Jr., 'Squire,' I, 15 *n.*; marriage, 84 *n.*, 103 *n.*; moves to Illinois, 102.
Hall, Matilda (Johnston), I, 84 *n.*, 103 *n.*
Hall, Nancy (Hanks), 15 *n.*, 73.
Hall, Wesley, I, 93 *n.*; Thomas Lincoln, 78.
Hall, Willard Preble, Nebraska, III, 175.
Hallett, Benjamin Franklin, III, 135.
Hamilton, Alexander, III, 53; leader of Federalist Party, I, 1; representation and slaves, III, 60.
Hamilton, Elizabeth (Schuyler), II, 106, 158.
Hammond, James Henry, III, 23 *n.*; miscegenation, 23 *n.*; riddance to slavery, 32 *n.*; punishment of slaves, 37 *n.*; happiness of slaves, 41; slave-holders, 42; cruelty to slaves, 43; separation of families, 51 *n.*; Bible and slavery, 55; mud-sills, IV, 317.
Hankins, William J., I, 246.
Hanks, Dennis (Friend), I, 58 *n.*, 64, 79; II, 212, 258; on Thomas Lincoln, I, 4 *n.*, 5 *n.*, 6 *n.*, 60, 66, 67; Thomas Lincoln's fight, 5 *n.*; credibility, 5 *n.*, 30 *n.*; birth, 15 *n.*, 45 *n.*; on Nancy Hanks, 15 *n.*, 16; Knob Creek farm, 27; on Lincoln's schooling, 29 *n.*, 63; war recollection, 31 *n.*; Thomas Lincoln's removal, 33 *n.*; Indiana tract, 40, 42, 43, 65; moves to Indiana, 44, 45; marriage, 45 *n.*, 70; boasting, 56 *n.*; toil, 57; Abraham's laziness, 68; songs, 68; religion, 72; early speeches, 81; jokes, 87; learning, 91; moves to Illinois, 95, 102, 103 *n.*; IV, 311; Lincoln's politics, I, 98.
Hanks, Elizabeth (Johnston), I, 70.
Hanks, Harriet A., I, 103 *n.*; II, 205, 208; Lincoln's flowers, 204; marries Chapman, 208 *n.*; in Lincoln's house, 212.
Hanks, John, on Nancy Hanks, I, 16 *n.*; in Indiana, 59; Abraham's schooling, 63; Thomas Lincoln, 67; goes to Illinois, 94, 103 *n.*; politics, 99 *n.*; New Orleans voyage, 105; slavery and Lincoln, 107.
Hanks, John Talbott, I, 103 *n.*
Hanks, Joseph, of Elizabethtown, I, 14, 18.
Hanks, Lucy, I, 14; indicted, 14 *n.*
Hanks, Mary, I, 37 *n.*
Hanks, Nancy, I, 14; parentage and picture, 15; Dennis Hanks on, 15 *n.*; marriage, 17.
Hanks, Nancy, mother of Dennis, I, 15 *n.*; lives with Hall, 15 *n.*, 73.
Hanks, Nancy, camp-meeting episode, I, 17 *n.*
Hanks, Nancy M., I, 103 *n.*
Hanks, Sarah (Polly), I, 15 *n.*
Hanks, Sarah J., I, 103 *n.*
Hanks, Sophie, I, 15 *n.*
Happy, William W., I, 236 *n.*
Hardin, John J., I, 165, 247, 271, 283 *n.*, 296; II, 8, 101, 136, 233; described, I, 180; Jackson resolutions, 186; getting votes, 198; internal improvements, 199 *n.*; bank examination, 203; liquor law, 249; Lincoln-Shields affair, II, 55; for Congress, 62, 65; Lincoln's assurances, 65, 73; refuses reëlection, 66; for governor, 74; runs again, 75; proposal to Lincoln, 75; withdraws, 76; war with Mexico, 79; votes, 86 *n.*; death, 92, 93, 131, 132 *n.*, 164.
Hardin, Martin Davis, I, 180.
Hardin County, Ky., I, 121; III, 314; slaves in, I, 13; lawyers, 18; people, 19; growth, 33.
Harding, George, reaper case, II, 279; prejudice, 286.
Harding, Jacob, III, 291.
Harding, Robert, I, 60 *n.*
Harper, Edward, I, 90.
Harper, William, described, III, 33 *n.*; servitude and civilization, 33 *n.*; cruel masters, 38; slave crimes, 51.
Harriott, James, II, 264 *n.*
Harris, Gibson W., in Lincoln's office, II, 202 *n.*
Harris, Thaddeus Mason, I, 38 *n.*

Harris, Thomas D., on Douglas, III, 148 *n.*
Harris, Thomas Langrell, III, 266; IV, 285; elected to Congress, II, 164 *n.*, 166; III, 273 *n.*; compromise measures, 116; disunion, 117; polygamy, 236; senatorial campaign, 281, 285; Kansas, IV, 171 *n.*; Douglas's fête, 176 *n.*; speech, 178 *n.*, 181, 182 *n.*; on Herndon, 188 *n.*; Leib, 227 *n.*
Harrison, George M., I, 122 *n.*
Harrison, Quinn (Peachy), murder case, II, 253.
Harrison, William Henry, II, 61, 62; candidate, I, 270.
Harrison-Tyler campaign, I, 271.
Harrison County, Ind., I, 34.
Harristown, Ill., I, 104 *n.*
Hat, receptacle for papers, II, 206; Lincoln's, 207.
Hatch, Ozias Mather, IV, 8 *n.*, 177 *n.*, 194 *n.*
Havana, Ill., Douglas and Lincoln at, IV, 282, 283 *n.*
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, III, 153 *n.*
Hay, C. D., IV, 195.
Hay, John, II, 59.
Hay, Logan, I, viii.
Hay, Milton, I, 245 *n.*, 255 *n.*; II, 202, 300.
Haycraft, Samuel, Sr., of Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 18 *n.*; gives land for church, 19.
Haycraft, Samuel, I, 3 *n.*; on Thomas Lincoln, 5 *n.*; credibility, 5 *n.*; on Nancy Hanks, 16 *n.*; Elizabethtown, 18 *n.*; lawyers, 19 *n.*; on Hazel, 28; marriage of Thomas Lincoln, 58; Lincoln at Knob Creek, 30.
Hayne, Robert Young, I, 100, 130.
Hazard, E. W., IV, 7 *n.*
Hazel, Caleb, school teacher, I, 28, 36 *n.*
Hazel, Mary (Stevens), I, 36 *n.*
Head, Jesse, I, 17.
Heath, James Elliott, I, x.
Hecker, Frederick, IV, 8.
Hedrick, Benjamin Sherwood, IV, 55 *n.*
Helm, Ben, of Elizabethtown, Ky., house, I, 18 *n.*, 19, 20.
Helm, Charles, of Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 18 *n.*
Helm, John B., birth of Lincoln, I, 3 *n.*; on Thomas Lincoln, 5 *n.*, 6 *n.*; Nancy Hanks, 16 *n.*
Helper, Hinton Rowan, 'Impending Crisis,' IV, 189, 340.
Hemingway, ——, II, 248.
Henderson, Archibald, on Filson, I, 8 *n.*
Henderson, Richard, I, 8 *n.*
Henderson, Thomas Jefferson, IV, 12 *n.*, 19 *n.*
Henning, Fanny, courted by Speed, II, 23, 26; marriage, 33.
Henry, Anson G., II, 45; candidate for probate judge, I, 215, 273 *n.*; II, 63 *n.*; postmaster, 18; Lincoln's courtship, 36.
Henry, James D., II, 203.
Henry, John, I, 243; IV, 316.
Henry, N. J., on Butterfield, II, 194.
Henry, Patrick, centralization, III, 62.
Henry, Ill., Lincoln at, IV, 294.
Herald of Freedom, III, 301 *n.*; nuisance, 332.
Herndon, Archer G., II, 2.
Herndon, James A., I, 126; Lincoln's reading, 135 *n.*
Herndon, J. Rowan, I, 111, 114, 121, 131; attacked, 124; store, 126; Lincoln's candidacy, 137.
Herndon, W. D. (H.?), II, 28 *n.*
Herndon, William Henry, I, 15 *n.*; II, 86, 100 *n.*, 190; III, 158, 292, 358; IV, 8 *n.*, 41, 48, 65, 74, 238, 257, 262, 310, 338; first sight of Lincoln, I, 118; *Talisman* and, 119; intimacy with Lincoln, II, 1 *n.*; Speed's clerk, 2; adoration of Lincoln, 2; Lincoln's religion, 4 *n.*; friends, 5; humor, 8 *n.*; Lincoln's avoidance of marriage, 16; Whitney on, 17 *n.*; Sarah Rickard, 21 *n.*; Lincoln's temperance address, 32 *n.*; duel, 53 *n.*; Mrs. Lincoln's temper, 59, 215; Lincoln's marriage, 59; Lincoln's law partner, 67, 200; IV, 229; devotion, II, 68; Petersburg Convention, 77; alarm, 131, 135, 137; politics, 148, 153; advised on kissing, 154; Lincoln's voice, 208; sons, 209; radical influence, 217; Lincoln's reading, 222; melancholy, 225, 226; Lincoln's politics, 229; eating, 235; drinking, 237; character, 240; honor, 245; anger, 253, 260; success, 275; Abolitionist, III, 19; reading, 30; 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 138; editorials, 238, 296 *n.*, 359 *n.*; Lincoln's ambition, 243; Peoria speech, 262; Douglas, 263; IV, 193; mayor, III, 263; Republican convention and Lincoln, 265; political activity, 275; prohibitionist, 294; Polly's son, 297; Kansas, 329; Republican Party, 353 *n.*, 356 *n.*; Decatur meeting, 359; Sangamon delegates, 360; Bloomington Convention, 361; IV, 18; Southern secession, 5; ratification meeting, 21; Frémont, 40; tricks an editor, 79; Dred Scott decision, 136; bank commissioner, 137, 161; Lincoln and Douglas, 148, 158; sees end of Douglas, 183, 185 *n.*; visit to the east, 187; interview with Greeley, 188; Parker and, 191 *n.*; house-divided speech, 212; Democrats divided, 229 *n.*
Higgins, Van Holst, II, 301.
Higginson, Thomas Wentworth, III, 219; IV, 162 *n.*; treason, 90.
Hildreth, Richard, novel, III, 25 *n.*, 138.
Hill, John H., III, 27.
Hill, Samuel, I, 126; postmaster, 131, 141; Ann Rutledge, 146; store, 147.
Hilliard, Henry Washington, disunion, III, 76.
Hillis, John, I, 121 *n.*
Hillis, Lois E., II, 239.
History, Lincoln on, II, 223.
Hoar, Ebenezer Rockwood, II, 169.
Hoar, George Frisbie, II, 169.
Hobson, Jonathan Todd, Lincoln cabin, I, 3 *n.*
Hodder, Frank Haywood, Pacific Railroad, III, 171 *n.*
Hodgen, Robert, of Hodgenville, Ky., I, 31.
Hodgen's mill, I, 23, 27.
Hoffman, Francis A., IV, 8, 19.
Hoffman's Row, Springfield, I, 209.
Hogan, John, Rev., I, 178, 223; internal improvements, 197.
Hogs, Thomas Lincoln's, I, 44; sewing eyes of, 107; evenly divided gang, II, 164.
Holcombe, William Henry, negro inferiority, III, 35.
Holland, Isaac, III, 349.
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 'Last Leaf,' II, 228.
Holmes, Oliver Wendell (Jr.), I, viii.
Hookworm and poor whites, III, 4 *n.*
Hooten, Reason, II, 237.
Hope, Dr., IV, 29.
Hopeton, Ga., slave hospital, III, 38 *n.*
Hopkins, John Henry, III, 56.
Hopkins, William, III, 285 *n.*; IV, 18.

Horner, Henry, IV, 187 *n.*
Horse, Frémont's woolly, IV, 76.
Horsey, father, IV, 67 *n.*
Hoskins, Jesse, I, 42.
Hospitals, slave, III, 38 *n.*
House divided, Lincoln uses, II, 61; III, 132, 321; IV, 71; text, 212; explanation, 241; war involved, 250, 259; Douglas on, 287, 292.
House of Entertainment, Vandalia, I, 160 *n.*
House raisings, I, 54.
Houston, Samuel, III, 357 *n.*; at San Jacinto, II, 81; Kansas-Nebraska bill, III, 215, 221.
Howard, William Alanson, Kansas committee, III, 339; IV, 43.
Howard Committee on Kansas, III, 303 *n.*, 339.
Howe, J. H., III, 307 *n.*
Howells, William Cooper, I, 51 *n.*
Howison, Robert R., free blacks, III, 51 *n.*
Hubbard, Gurdon Saltonstall, I, 177.
Hudson, Charles, II, 170, 171 *n.*, 176; war with Mexico, 121, 126, 127.
Huff, Ind., I, 39 *n.*
Hughes, Morgan, I, 11 *n.*
Hughes Station, Ky., I, 11.
Humphreys, Alexander, II, 11.
Humphreys, Elizabeth, II, 11.
Hundley, Daniel Robinson, 'Social Relations,' III, 4 *n.*; Southern oligarchy, 21 *n.*
Hungate, Joab, I, 55 *n.*
Hunter, Robert Mercer Taliaferro, II, 110; III, 352; IV, 343; compromise measures, I, 112; secession, 112; described, 113 *n.*; Kansas-Nebraska, III, 199 *n.*; at Poughkeepsie, IV, 54 *n.*
Huntress, the, II, 105.
Hurd, ——, II, 301, 304.
Hurricane township, Ind., I, 47.
Hurst, Charles R., II, 20.
Huston, Felix, III, 124 *n.*
Huston, John, II, 274 *n.*

Iglehart, John Eugene, I, 98 *n.*
Iles, Elijah, captain, I, 123; on Adams, 217 *n.*
Illinois, removal of Lincolns, I, 94, 102, 103 *n.*; in 1827, 103 *n.*; great snow, 1830–31, 104; settlements, 108 *n.*; politics, 114; militia law, 120; State House, Vandalia, 163, 176; criminal and slave laws, 163, 248, 287; II, 96 *n.*; State Banks, I, 166, 170, 198, 200, 232, 242; apportionment, 170, 174, 254; II, 62; IV, 257; capital, I, 175; quality of legislature, 177, 238; Southern protests on abolition, 192; finances, 199 *n.*, 256, 276; State funds in banks, 243; Georgia protest, 247; liquor laws, 249, 268, 288; III, 228, 293; advantages, I, 252; special session, time of ending, 277; bonds and debt, 284; public printer, 291; Supreme Court judges, 292; tenure of Secretary of State, 293; votes of unnaturalized, 294; suspension of tax collections, II, 38; war with Mexico, 79, 91, 94; III, 116; volunteers, II, 83; Constitutional Convention, 93; in 1849, 197; towns, 198 *n.*; roads, 198, 218; courts, 215; prairies, 232; currency in circulation, 259; anti-slavery societies, III, 19 *n.*; journals, 20 *n.*; fugitive slaves, 109; anti-slavery movement, 142; election, 1852, 163; slavery, 192, 268, 292 *n.*; IV, 236, 320; Kansas-Nebraska bill, III, 195, 208, 292 *n.*; Republican Party, 264; election, 1854, 273; senatorial contest, 283; prohibition, 293; distrust of Frémont, IV, 39; Kansas, 47; Frémont campaign, 56, 80; panic, 1857, 160; free negroes, 251; Republican platform, 285; politics, 336; campaign of 1860, 343.
Illinois Advocate, I, 160 *n.*
Illinois Central Railroad, I, 174 *n.*, 198; II, 232, 249; III, 169; tax suit, II, 287; difficulties, 292, 295; hog case, 297; tax dispute, 299; temperance, III, 228 *n.*; assignment, IV, 161.
Illinois College, Jacksonville, I, 150; Lovejoy murder, 227.
Illinois Register, I, 160 *n.*
Immigration and Know-Nothings, III, 223.
Improvements, internal, Illinois, I, 116, 174, 196; convention, 196; report, 196; county demands, 197; act, 198; panic of 1837, 232, 236; policy, 238; Lincoln's land proposition, 251; disillusion, 257; opposed, 265; debt, 276, 283; liquidated, 287.
Independence, Mo., III, 312.
Independent Treasury, I, 239, 240, 241, 243; Democrats protest, 244; Lincoln's speech, 258. *See* Bank of the United States.
Indian country, III, 108.
Indiana, III, 270; Thomas Lincoln in, I, 37; described, 38; life in, 50; dialect, 53; schools, 53, 55; legal tender, 55; laws of, 74; courts, 90; roads, 90; war with Mexico, II, 79 *n.*; liquor law, III, 293 *n.*; supports Douglas, IV, 179; at Chicago Convention, 351.
Indianapolis, I, 38; II, 197 *n.*; Frémont meeting, IV, 65.
Indians, young, II, 136, 144, 195.
Indictments in Indiana, I, 53 *n.*
Industrial Luminary, III, 315.
Ingalls, John E., III, 307 *n.*, 336.
Ingalls, John James, III, 336 *n.*
Ingle, John, I, 51 *n.*, 53 *n.*, 57 *n.*
Ingraham, Joseph Holt, 'Southwest,' III, 11; planters, 11; slave parties, 40; slaves and freedom, 41; slaves necessary, 46; slave breeding, 47; auctions, 47; churches, 48 *n.*
Inslee, Joseph, III, 279 *n.*
Iowa, III, 251; lands in, II, 256; migration, III, 167; slavery, 192; goes Whig, 240; Lincoln invited, IV, 41.
Iroquois County, II, 242, 249.
Irwin, Benjamin Franklin, I, 121 *n.*; III, 267 *n.*

Jackson, Andrew, I, 281; II, 161; followers, I, 96; candidate, 97; strength in Illinois, 115; nullification, 129; contest with bank, 167, 184; censure, 171; slave-holder, III, 54; Taney and, IV, 115; court decisions, 150, 244.
Jackson and Adams, song, I, 69.
Jackson, Mich., Republican Party, III, 264.
Jackson, Miss., III, 71, 135.
Jacksonville, Ill., I, 175, 207 *n.*; IV, 65; Lovejoy murder, I, 226.
Jamaica, emancipation in, III, 36.
James, Benjamin F., II, 74.
Jameson, John, reply to Lincoln, II, 131, 133.
Jaquith, ——, II, 289 *n.*
Jayne, David, 'Almanac,' II, 273.
Jayne, Gershom, II, 10, 14 *n.*, 148 *n.*
Jayne, Julia, II, 10 *n.*, 58; III, 286; Lincoln's courtship, II, 36; marriage, 36 *n.*; Rebecca letter, 46, 55 *n.*; rhyme on Shields, 47.
Jayne, William, II, 36 *n.*, 58; III, 267 *n.*; house-divided speech, IV, 213 *n.*

Jefferson, Peter, II, 12 *n.*; III, 7.
Jefferson, Thomas, favor with the masses, I, 1; Age of Reason, 138; bank, 243; Declaration, III, 53; slave-holder, 54; Missouri Compromise, 151; slavery, 245; Supreme Court, IV, 130, 260; declaration, 215.
Jefferson County, Ky., I, 10, 11.
Jenkins, Frederick [Shadrach], III, 145 *n.*
'John Anderson's Lamentation,' I, 69.
Johnson, Albert Sidney, I, 124 *n.*
Johnson, Allen, on Douglas, III, 271 *n.*
Johnson, Andrew, II, 183 *n.*
Johnson, Benjamin, III, 315 *n.*
Johnson, Gabriel, I, 19 *n.*
Johnson, Hadley D., delegate, III, 174, 183.
Johnson, John O., IV, 187, 189.
Johnson, Reverdy, II, 110, 279; Dred Scott, IV, 98; defends court, 134.
Johnson, Richard Mentor, I, 172; attack on, 222; candidate, 270.
Johnson, S. T., Lincoln and Brackenridge, I, 91 *n.*
Johnson, Thomas, Rev., III, 174, 183.
Johnson, William S., II, 301 *n.*
Johnston, Abe, II, 182.
Johnston, Andrew, I, 257; receives verses from Lincoln, II, 86.
Johnston, Daniel, marries Sarah Bush, I, 17 *n.*; death, 57.
Johnston, Elizabeth, I, 57 *n.*; marriage to Hanks, 45 *n.*, 70, 103 *n.*
Johnston, John D., I, 58; Thomas Lincoln and, 66; fight with Grigsby, 93; moves to Illinois, 102, 103 *n.*; New Orleans voyage, 105; asks for money, II, 181; Thomas Lincoln's illness, 212.
Johnston, Matilda, I, 58, 61; Abraham's kindliness, 67; marriage, 84, 103 *n.*
Johnston, Sarah, I, 58.
Johnston, Sarah (Bush), widow, I, 57; marries Thomas Lincoln, 58.
Johnston, Saunders W., III, 318 *n.*
Johnston, Tom, II, 182.
Johnston, William Freame, III, 357.
Joliet, Ill., IV, 249.
Jones, Charles Colcock, cruelty to slaves, III, 42 *n.*; separation of families, 51 *n.*
Jones, Isaac, I, 90 *n.*
Jones, James Chamberlain, III, 181 *n.*
Jones, John, I, 148 *n.*
Jones, Samuel J., sheriff, III, 326, 328, 334; shot, 331.
Jones, William, of Gentryville, I, 86, 97, 99.
Jones, William, II, 301 *n.*
Jonesboro, IV, 286; debate at, 310.
Joy, James F., II, 277 *n.*, 292 *n.*; Ill. Central case, 287, 290, 296; fee, 291.
Judas and the sub-treasury, I, 261.
Judd, Norman Buel, II, 294, 303; IV, 19, 74, 159, 177 *n.*, 195, 196 *n.*, 346; anti-Nebraska, III, 279; Bloomington Convention, 360; IV, 3; party, 4; Douglas, 176 *n.*, 183, 183 *n.*, 197, 204 *n.*; Wentworth, 206; Trumbull, 248; objects to question, 295; Bates, 341.
Julian, George Washington, compromise measures, III, 125; Free-Soil Convention, 156; protest against Cameron, IV, 351 *n.*
Jury, Grand, invites Douglas, IV, 139.

Kane, Elias Kent, I, 234 *n.*
Kane County, II, 277; resolutions, IV, 286, 293, 301.
Kankakee County, II, 242.
Kansas, III, 183; emigration societies, 258 *n.*, 299; in 1854, 297; Hale on, 300 *n.*; Howard Committee, 303 *n.*, 339; authorities, 305 *n.*; election, 1854, 309; legion, 310, 311; census, 310; election, 1855, 311, 316; Southern indifference, 314; bogus legislature, 316, 320; land speculation, 319; slavery in, 319, 326; IV, 165; Free-State Party, III, 320, 322, 325; law and order party, 325; treaty of peace, 327; aid for, 329; Pierce's message and proclamation, 331, 336; Douglas's report, 337; Toombs's bill, 338; Free-State Constitution, 338; Republican meetings, IV, 20; platform, 30; bleeding, 42; migration stopped, 45; reign of terror, 48; free, convention, 48; Choate on, 52; Geary in, 61; peace, 82; convention to frame constitution, 138; election, 149; Lecompton Constitution, 165, 167, 168, 180, 198; English bill, 199; admission of, 302; Lincoln in, 342.
Kansas Free State, nuisance, III, 332.
Kansas-Nebraska bill, III, 183; IV, 216; caucus, III, 194; vote, 216 *n.*; Act, 268, 322.
Kaskaskia River, I, 160.
Kearny, Stephen W., II, 84.
Keitt, Lawrence Massillon, III, 349, 351, 352 *n.*; IV, 64 *n.*; on Frémont, 54.
Kellogg, Ensign H., IV, 347.
Kellogg's Grove, I, 123.
Kelso, Jack, I, 135; III, 308.
Kemble, Frances Anne (Fanny), on poor whites, III, 4 *n.*; 'Journal,' 5 *n.*; marriage, 5 *n.*; Southern manners, 12; slave mortality, 15 *n.*; Southern fears, 17 *n.*; negro laziness, 35 *n.*; overworked slaves, 37 *n.*; slave hospital, 38 *n.*; laws as support of system, 43 *n.*; religious teaching, 48 *n.*
Kent, James, chancellor, II, 156.
Kent, Joseph P., II, 308 *n.*
Kentucky, III, 118; migration to, I, 8, 32; patrollers, 13; War of 1812, 31; development, 32; currency, 32 *n.*; road surveyor, 36 *n.*; resolution on Abolitionists, 189; emancipation, III, 109; Nashville Convention, 121.
'Kentucky Preceptor,' I, 75.
Ketcham, Isaac J., II, 308.
Key, Francis Scott, II, 142 *n.*
Key, Philip Barton, II, 142 *n.*
Kilbreath, Arvin, I, 11 *n.*
King, Thomas Butler, II, 152 *n.*
King, Turner R., II, 86 *n.*; Mrs. Lincoln, 211 *n.*
King, William Rufus, III, 149; IV, 57 *n.*
'King's Jester,' I, 83.
King's Mountain, S.C., IV, 55 *n.*
Kinkead, George B., II, 248.
Kinney, William, I, 109.
Kirkham's Grammar, I, 133.
Kirkpatrick, Joseph, house, I, 31.
Kirkpatrick, William, I, 121.
Kitchell, Alfred, IV, 276 *n.*
Kitchell, Wickliffe, changes in laws, I, 287; anecdote, 290.
Klein *vs.* A. & S.R.R. Co., II, 276 *n.*
Knapp, Isaac, III, 25 *n.*
Knob Creek, Ky., I, 29; farm, 26 *n.*; sale of, 35; ejectment suits, 34.
Know-Nothings, II, 71; origin, III, 223; South-

ern, 224; decline, 353; Lincoln on, 354; convention, 357; IV, 24.
Knox, James, III, 273 *n.*
Knox, Joseph, II, 303.
Knox, William, Mortality, II, 87, 210, 226, 227, 239.
Koerner, Gustave, III, 358; IV, 35, 136, 208, 346; at Belleville, II, 93 *n.*; lieutenant governor, III, 284; liquor law, 293 *n.*; on Lincoln, IV, 158.
Kossuth, Thaddeus, III, 38 *n.*
Kraft's brass band, III, 242.

Labor and slavery, III, 31, 98; IV, 13, 77; conditions at the North, III, 44; votes, IV, 77; movement, 162, 209 *n.*
Lacon, Ill., III, 271.
Lafayette, Marquis de, III, 50.
Lafayette Co., Mo., resolutions, III, 302 *n.*, 311 *n.*
La Follette, Isaac, I, 34 *n.*
La Follette, Jesse, I, 34 *n.*
Lamar, John B., III, 43 *n.*, 45 *n.*
Lamar, John W., I, 55 *n.*, 80, 92.
Lamar, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus, Kansas, IV, 170 *n.*, 171.
Lamborn, Josiah, I, 177, 258, 261.
Lamon, Dorothy, II, 220 *n.*
Lamon, Ward Hill, II, 16 *n.*, 233, 238, 261; partner of Lincoln, 220; life of Lincoln, 220 *n.*; liquor, 236; excessive fee, 262; recollections, 263.
Land Office, commissioner of, Lincoln for, II, 191.
Lands, public, disposition of, I, 164, 174; Lincoln's proposition, 251; Clay's bill, II, 61; colleges, IV, 208.
Lane, Harriet, IV, 28, 176.
Lane, Henry Smith, IV, 30, 36 *n.*, 348, 351.
Lane, James Henry, III, 331; IV, 44 *n.*; Kansas migration III, 305 *n.*; described, 323; Lawrence, 326, 327; Senator, 331; indicted, 332; constitution, 338; speech, IV, 6, 19.
Lane, John, II, 261.
Lane, Joseph, IV, 346.
Lanphier, Charles Henry, III, 165, 196; editor, II, 80 *n.*; praises Douglas, III, 243; senatorial election, 280; attacks Trumbull, 289; Republican resolutions, IV, 285, 293.
La Rue County, Ky., I, 34.
La Salle, II, 288.
La Salle Co., IV, 284 *n.*
Law, higher, Seward, III, 105, 111, 118, 134; Chase, 111.
Law office, Lincoln's, II, 201.
Lawrence, Amos Adams, III, 306, 316; against Republican Party, IV, 53.
Lawrence, George, II, 230 *n.*
Lawrence, Kas., III, 301 *n.*, 306, 319; Free-State Hotel, 315, 327, 332; IV, 5; convention, III, 322; investment of, 326; sack of, 334.
Lawyers' fees, II, 255.
Learned, Marion Dexter, I, 6 *n.*
Leaton, Clara, II, 210 *n.*
Leavy, William, of Lexington, Ky., I, 21 *n.*
Lebanon, II, 24.
Lecompte, Samuel Dexter, III, 332; founds Lecompton, 319.
Lecompton, Kas., III, 319.
Lecompton Constitution, IV, 165, 168, 198, 231, 241; compromise, 167; voted, 180.
Lee, Henry, III, 54 *n.*
Lee, Robert Edward, I, 2 *n.*; II, 94.
Leg, cork, I, 262; II, 41 *n.*
Legacy, song, I, 136.
Legislature, Illinois, session 1834–35, I, 163; extra session, 1835, 170; session 1836, 175; internal improvements, 196.
Leib, Charles, IV, 226, 228, 266.
Lewis, Dixon Hall, Wilmot proviso, II, 122.
Lewiston, Ill., Lincoln at, IV, 283 *n.*
Lexington, Ky., I, 20.
Lexington, Mo., III, 320.
Lexington, Va., II, 278.
Liberator, established, I, 187; Lovejoy murder, 225; Herndon reads, III, 19 *n.*; disunion movement, 75 *n.*; on Webster, 129.
Liberty Bell, III, 28.
Liberty Party, nominations, I, 270; II, 71.
License, *see* Liquor laws.
Lightfoot, John, II, 21 *n.*
Lincoln, Abraham, in Virginia, I, 6, 7; removes to Kentucky, 7; land warrants, 9; Green River tract, 10; Campbell County land, 10 *n.*; at Hughes Station, 11; death, 11; campaign of 1844, II, 71.
Lincoln, Abraham, II, 137; birth, I, 2, 23; in Virginia, 7; on grandfather, 15; schooling, 28, 29, 55, 62; at Knob Creek, 29; in Indiana, 45; dialect words, 54; learns to write, 56 *n.*, 62; on blessings, 60; eating, 60; II, 235; rides to mill, I, 62; copy-book, 64; kindness to animals, 64, 143; writes poetry, 64, 84; reading, 65, 67, 69, 72, 134, 140; II, 2, 222; treatment by father, I, 65, 77; capacity for affection, 66; good nature, 66; stepmother and, 66; laziness, 67; singing, 68, 72, 136; repeats sermons, 71; religion, 71, 140; II, 3; Bible reading, I, 72; social qualities, 78; love of jokes, 79, 83, 86, 106, 136; II, 2, 107, 205, 233; honesty, I, 80, 113; dislike for girls, 80; appearance, 81; II, 206, 282; speech-making, I, 81; essays, 82; drinking, 82, 113; II, 236, 237; III, 241; swearing, I, 83, 113; runs ferry, 84; physical strength, 87; New Orleans voyages, 87, 105; slavery, 88, 107, 195, 248; II, 24, 183; III, 30, 321; boatman, I, 89; 'Chronicles of Reuben,' 92; William Grigsby, 93; political party, 96; moves to Illinois, 102, 104; aids dog, 103; boat stranding, 106; sewing eyes of hogs, 107; at New Salem, 108; II, 203, 271; election clerk, I, 109; fights Armstrong, 111; strength, 112; influence, 112; a candidate, 114, 124, 137; address, 115; political skill, 118; *Talisman* and, 118; suit against, 119 *n.*; Black Hawk War, 120; II, 162; captain, I, 121; popularity, 122, 137; II, 221; first speech, I, 124; defeat, 126; Berry's partner, 127, 143 *n.*; II, 203; newspapers, I, 128; II, 205; postmaster, I, 131, 141; surveyor, 132; studies grammar, 133; circus, 136.

Elected to Legislature, I, 138, 152; French philosophy, 139; mental trouble, 140, 150, 170; II, 16, 17, 26; studies law, I, 141; love of children, 142; horse, etc., sold for debt, 143; attitude towards women, 144; II, 9; Mary Owens, I, 145, 154; Ann Rutledge, 146; conditional engagement, 149; grief over her death, 151; campaign for reëlection, 152; questions Allen, 153; Forquer and, 153; engagement to Mary Owens, 155; letters to, 155; in Vandalia and Legislature, 162; committee appointment, 164; public lands, 164, 251; measures and votes, 164, 165 *n.*, 205 *n.*, 254 *n.*, 265, 282,

288; banks, 166, 168, 170, 200, 236, 267; special session, 1835, 170; newspaper letters, 171 *n.*, 183, 205 *n.*, 215, 270; session 1836, 175, 182; Whig floor leader, 175, 182, 254; division of country, 183; political education, 187, 282; slavery in District of Columbia, 194; II, 103, 183; III, 252; IV, 299; protest on abolition resolutions, I, 194, 206; removal of capital, 199, 204, 235; defence of bank, 200, 242, 267; removes to Springfield, 206, 208; admitted to bar, 206; melancholy, 208; II, 8, 209, 224; III, 291; partnership with Stuart, I, 209; toast, 211; law business, 211, 264; II, 200; interest in politics, I, 212; II, 5; relations with Francis, I, 212; controversy with Adams, 213, 227 *n.*; Lyceum speech on mobs, 227; attack by Ewing, 235; internal improvements, 236, 251, 265, 283; defeated for Speaker, 238, 276; session 1838, 238; report on banks, 240; Democratic protest, 244; liquor laws, 250, 268, 288; public lands purchase, 251, 256, 270; on number nine, 254; Douglas-Stuart contest, 255; independent treasury speech, 258; answered and praised, 263; fling at Douglas, 264; Harrison-Tyler campaign, 272; renominated, 274; last session, 275; adjournment of special session, 277; jump from window, 279; interest on State debt, 284; incapacitated by sickness, 289; retort to Kitchell, 290; public printer, 291.

Life in Springfield, II, 1, 7; memory, 3; church attendance, 4, 104; study of style, 4; law practice, 5, 25; in Whig Junto, 5, 7; attacked, 6; 'Madison' letters, 7; social failure, 8; cotillion party, 8; meets Mary Todd, 13; engaged, 14; doubts, 14, 36, 57; letter to Drake, 15; wedding avoided, 16; Henry's appointment, 18; to Stuart on politics, 19; Logan's law partner, 20, 67; visit to Speed, 20, 21; Sarah Rickard, 20, 27, 34; aids Speed's courtship, 23; poem on suicide, 24; tooth trouble, 25; calls Whig Convention, 25; heartens Speed, 26; Bowling Green's burial, 27; temperance address, 27; Speed's marriage, 33; entertains Van Buren, 35; self-confidence, 35; fatalism, 36, 229; renews courtship, 36, 57; 'Rebecca' letters, 40, 51; election returns, 46; affair with Shields, 48, 65 *n.*; III, 113; conditions of duel, II, 52; lesson learned, 56; marriage, 57; on conventions, 60; Whig address, 60; runs for Congress, 62; 1846, 73; sons, 62 *n.*, 66; church vote, 63; aristocracy candidate, 63, 67; buys a house, 68; nominated, 77; pledge, 78; Sangamo Journal, 79; elected to Congress, 86; verses, 86; 'Mortality,' 87, 210, 226, 227, 239; 'Bear Hunt,' 88; Chicago Convention, 88, 155; Matson case, 97; Bailey-Cromwell case, 98.

Goes to Washington, II, 101; diversions, 107; committees, 108; in House, 108; votes, 108 *n.*, 152 *n.*, 183; first speech, 108; Texas and Mexico, 123; extension of slavery, 124; III, 258; IV, 72; spot resolutions, II, 125, 135; IV, 224, 263, 305; Ashmun resolution, II, 126; IV, 316; speech on Mexico and Texas, II, 127; right of revolution, 129; neglect of, 131; defence, 131, 135; criticized, 132; young Indian, 136; Taylor's campaign, 136, 144, 150; death of Adams, 138; votes on slavery, 138; war, 139; letters to wife, 140, 153; Whig convention, 145, 165; Rough and Ready Club, 148; young men, 148, 153; Crittenden dinner, 150; Texan boundary, 151; advice to Taylor, 152; kissing, 154; internal improvement speech, 155; amending constitution, 156; speech on Taylor, 159; political situation, 165; visits Massachusetts, 166; Worcester speech, 173; offends, 176; Lincoln's dinner, 177; Boston and Seward, 178; speeches, 179; III, 115; speaks in Chicago, II, 180; III, 272; aids father, II, 182; last session, 182; slave motion, 184; refused office, 190; Illinois patronage, 191; opposes Butterfield, 192; advice to Clayton, 194; governor of Oregon, 195; failure, 196.

Return to law, II, 197, 200; III, 291; invited to Chicago, II, 201; law office, 201; neglect of business, 202; house and garden, 204; manners and habits, 205; one gallus, 205, 231; dress, 205, 255; voice, 207; children and, 208, 215; church attendance, 208 *n.*; home life, 211, 213; hired girl, 211; father's illness, 212; entertaining and table, 214; on circuit, 215, 232; Davis and, 217; Gillespie on, 219; slow mind, 221, 275; names town, 221; books on circuit, 221; interest in science, 222; history and biography, 223; lecture on speech, 224; superstition, 229; helpful to young lawyers, 230; suffrage, 234; aloofness, 238; love of shows, 238; 'Dixie,' 239; absence of jealousy, 239, 284; inscrutable, 240; religion, 241; political discussion, 243; fairness, 244; acts as judge, 246; Todd estate, 248; lawyer, 249; ridicule, 254; fees, 256, 262; suits for, 258; Wright case, 259; Daimwood, 261; Scott, 261; Armstrong, 263; Gill, 265 *n.*; success, 275; Supreme Court, 276; railroad practice, 277; legal briefs, 277; Edwards, 277; reaper case, 278; effect on, 284; Illinois Central, 287, 297; fee, 291; IV, 159, 161; railroad passes, II, 293 *n.*, 296, 297; IV, 194 *n.*; land opinion, II, 297; sand bar case, 300; Rock Island bridge, 361; IV, 159.

Influence of South, III, 2; abolition movement, 19, 151, 241, 273; amalgamation, 26; Southern opinions, 30, 32; leaders, 72, 78; house-divided speech, 132, 321; IV, 71, 212, 241, 259; spokesman of people, III, 143; Fugitive Slave Law, 143, 250; IV, 14, 299; Whig Convention, 1850, III, 149; national committee, 150; oration on Clay, 151; colonization, 152, 249; IV, 155; Scott Club speech, III, 154, 158; higher law, 160; in 1852, 164, 252; introduces Fillmore, 238; prepares for campaign of 1854, 238; editorials, 238, 240 *n.*; IV, 78 *n.*; Calhoun example, III, 239; writes to Palmer, 240; ambition awakened, 243; answers Douglas, 243; Peoria speech, 244, 268; Missouri Compromise, 246, 251, 259; IV, 13, 23, 57, 88; anti-slavery, III, 249, 297; gradual emancipation, 250; Compromise of 1850, 252; popular sovereignty, 255; slavery moral wrong, 255, 270; IV, 317, 322; equality of men, III, 255; IV, 87; slave trade, III, 256; Kansas-Nebraska, 258, 269, 322; evades Republican Convention, 265; State committee, 266, 276; speaking agreement with Douglas, 270; personal appeal, 272.

Candidate for Senate, III, 274; resigns from Legislature, 275; neglect of, 278; defeat, 287; IV, 21; explains, III, 287; cheated, 289, 292; Harding and, 291; prohibition campaign, 295; silence, 296; Polly's son, 297; relation with Delahay, 308, 324; IV, 48; to Speed on slavery,

III, 321; Kansas, 329; IV, 13, 48, 149; Republican Party, III, 353, 355; defines his politics, 354; Decatur meeting, 358; name signed to call, 360; Bloomington Convention, 361; IV, 1; joins Republicans, III, 361; hopeful, IV, 2; first spectacles, 3; lost speech, 11; local law, 16; disunion, 17, 58, 80, 91; the Presidency, 18; Decatur speech, 23; against Frémont, 34; for vice-president, 36; campaigning, 41, 49, 65, 70; speaks at Springfield, 48; sectionalism, 56, 72; Conservative on, 59; deal, 59; campaign letters, 74; Chicago banquet, 85; campaign for Senate, 139, 186, 195; reply to Douglas, 1857, 148; Utah, 148; Dred Scott decision, 150, 243, 323; condition of negroes, 151; negro equality, 152, 244, 261, 288, 312, 331; declaration of independence, 154; criticized, 156; conspiracy, 158, 261, 282, 289, 292, 301; panic of 1857, 160; Douglas and Buchanan, 184, 331; Wentworth, 187, 206; on Greeley, 187, 198; Douglas's message, 188; Parker's sentence, 189; endorsed for Senate, 207, 210; Stephen, Franklin, etc., 219, 297; attack on Douglas, 221; at Edwardsville, 227; Chicago, 238; Bloomington, 253; Volk and, 253; Springfield, 257; on Douglas, 257; trailing Douglas, 267; debates arranged, 268; Bement episode, 272; contrast to Douglas, 275; will not fight, 283; at Ottawa, 284; career described, 287; dodges questions, 291, 294; questions Douglas, 294, 300; described, 297; at Freeport, 297; answers questions, 298; pledges in 1855, 309; Douglas's hopes, 309; at Jonesboro, 310; at Charleston, 311; at Galesburg, 317; Beecher on, 320 *n.*; at Quincy, 321; Schurz on, 325; at Alton, 329; defeat, 334; costs, 335; the presidency, 338; in Ohio, 339; Brown's raid, 340; Bates, 341; visits Kansas, 342; Cooper Institute speech, 342; nominated, 349; elected, 351.

Lincoln, Bathsheba, I, 7 *n.*

Lincoln, Edward Baker, II, 88 *n.*, 141, 143; death, 208.

Lincoln, Ezra, II, 178 *n.*

Lincoln, Hannaniah, I, 10, 11 *n.*

Lincoln, John, I, 6, 7.

Lincoln, Josiah, I, 34.

Lincoln, Levi, dinner, II, 177.

Lincoln, Mary, I, 58 *n.*

Lincoln, Mary (Todd), II, 179, 190, 248, 280; temper, 59, 210, 211 *n.*; goes to Washington, 101; goes to Lexington, 140; letter to, 140; letter from, 143; desire to travel, 143; servants, 154, 211; flowers and trees, 204; Presbyterian church, 208; table and parties, 214; stinginess, 214 *n.*; enlarges house, 308; reading, III, 30; slavery, 31; Senate election, 285, 286; Julia Jayne, 286; at Alton, IV, 329 *n.* *See* Mary Todd.

Lincoln, Mordecai, tax return, I, 10; on father's death, 11 *n.*, 12; education, 12; Bailey's Dictionary, 21, 64, 73.

Lincoln, Nancy (Hanks), church membership, I, 19; signs by mark, 26 *n.*; moves from Knob Creek, 35; to Indiana, 41; death, 48.

Lincoln, Robert Todd, II, 89, 143, 215, 229; birth, 66; goes to Washington, 101; Lexington, 140; dream on, 141; freedom, 209; sale of land, 256 *n.*

Lincoln, Sarah, birth, I, 22; cooks, 49, 57 *n.*; schooling, 55; marriage, 84.

Lincoln, Sarah (Bush | Johnston), I, 80; influence of, 59; on Abraham's eating, 60; studies, 63, 70, 77; Abraham's good nature, 66; books, 70; Abraham's religion, 71; newspapers, 97; removals, 108.

Lincoln, Thomas, I, 12; picture of, 4; fight, 5 *n.*; birth, 6; want of education, 12, 21; land in Hardin County, 12; at Elizabethtown, 13, 17, 21; patroller, 13; marriage, 17; church membership, 19; mumps, 21 *n.*; sues Geoghegan, 22; leaves Elizabethtown, 22; leaves Sinking Spring farm, 25; on Knob Creek, 26; removes from Knob Creek, 32, 35; slavery and, 33; ejectment suit, 34; road repair, 35; obscurity, 35 *n.*; churched and baptized, 36, 71, 95; horses, 36 *n.*; moves to Indiana, 37, 39, 40, 41; cabin, 45, 59; land warrant, 47, 70, 95; marries Sarah Johnston, 58; carpenter, 61; treatment of Abraham, 65, 77, 81; II, 212; good nature, I, 67; contempt for education, 78; mill, 91 *n.*; removal to Illinois, 94, 102; in Coles County, 108; asks for money, II, 181; never visits Lincoln, 212; illness and death, 212; land, 213 *n.*

Lincoln, Thomas ('Tad'), II, 208.

Lincoln, Timothy D., II, 303.

Lincoln, William Sever, State's attorney, I, 292 *n.*

Lincoln, William Wallace, II, 208.

Lincoln, Ill., II, 245; naming of, 221.

Lincoln County, Ky, I, 9.

Lincoln family, I, 6; politics, 99 *n.*

'Lincoln at New Salem,' I, 106 *n.*

Linder, Usher Ferguson, I, 178 *n.*; II, 234; IV, 192; described, I, 180; Sangamon County, 183; bank examination, 200, 203; attorney general, 201 *n.*, 223; Lincoln's courage, 235; Douglas-Stuart contest, 255 *n.*; Lincoln's duel, II, 53; Matson case, 96, 100; Taylor-Polk, 144; court gatherings, 237; For-God's-sake, IV, 293.

Lindley, James Johnston, Nebraska, III, 172 *n.*

Lindsey, George, I, 34 *n.*

Linkhorn, form of Lincoln, I, 24 *n.*

Liquor laws, I, 268, 288; IV, 277; Illinois, petitions, I, 249; Maine, III, 228.

Little Mount church, I, 36.

Little Pigeon Creek, Ind., I, 41. *See* Pigeon Creek.

Littlefield, John H., II, 202 *n.*

Lobby, legislative, I, 169.

Lockwood, Samuel Drake, I, 177, 296 *n.*; IV, 234.

Locofocos, II, 147; III, 159.

Log-rolling, I, 54.

Logan, John, I, 266.

Logan, John Alexander, I, 266 *n.*; II, 79 *n.*; III, 285; IV, 190.

Logan, Milton, II, 263 *n.*, 273.

Logan, Stephen Trigg, I, 258; II, 19, 60, 77, 78, 233 *n.*, 290, 300; III, 116; toast on internal improvements, I, 211 *n.*; in Adams case, 213, 217; Whig Junto, II, 5, 7; Lincoln's law partner, 20, 67; Taylor campaign, 149; Lincoln's letters, 149 *n.*; defeated, 164, 166, 180; on Lincoln's defeat, III, 292; defeated, 353.

Logan and Baker, law business, I, 212 *n.*

Logan County, II, 6 *n.*, 221, 250, 256.

Long Nine, the, I, 176, 198, 204, 205, 206, 210, 254.

Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth, II, 169.

Lord, Nathan, III, 56.

Lord, ——, II, 250 *n.*
Loring, Caleb, III, 130 *n.*
Loring, Edward Greely, III, 220 *n.*
Louisiana, Texas, II, 83; planters, III, 11; fugitive slaves, 109; Nashville Convention, 121.
Louisiana Purchase, II, 114.
Louisiana, Mo., II, 56.
Louisville, Ky., III, 353.
Louisville Journal, I, 97.
Lovejoy, Elijah Parish, I, 178 *n.*, 249, 263; III, 20 *n.*; at St. Louis, I, 219; removes to Alton, 220; pledge, 221; favors abolition, 222; death, 224; II, 2, 176.
Lovejoy, Owen, III, 265, 282, 353, 356 *n.*; IV, 29, 288, 307; urges Lincoln, III, 354; Bloomington Convention, IV, 7.
Lowell, James Russell, II, 169.
Lowell, John, II, 190.
Lowell, John Amory, III, 130 *n.*
Lowell, Mass., Lincoln in, II, 178.
Lucas, Allen Thurman, II, 264 *n.*, 266 *n.*
Lumpkin, Joseph Henry, II, 189 *n.*; emancipation, III, 32 *n.*, 33 *n.*
Lundy, Benjamin, Genius of Universal Emancipation, II, 100 *n.*; III, 20 *n.*; Texas colony, II, 116; slave plot, 116.
Lyell, Sir Charles, Southern society, III, 3; journeys to South, 3 *n.*; deceived, 22 *n.*; hospital for slaves, 38 *n.*; negro Saturnalia, 40; fugitive slaves, 41; slave crimes, 51 *n.*; separation of families, 51 *n.*

McBee, Mrs. Vardry Echols, I, x.
McCall, George Archibald, on Reynolds, I, 122 *n.*
McCandless, James, II, 203.
McClellan, George Brinton, war with Mexico, II, 94; Illinois Central R.R., 298, 300 *n.*
McClernand, John Alexander, I, 210, 295; II, 8 *n.*, 39, 131, 196, 308; described, I 179; on Jackson and Bank, 184, 187; abolition protests, 192, 194; internal improvements, 198; compelling attendance, 278; Secretary of State, 293; wife, II, 14 *n.*
McClernand, Sarah (Dunlap), II, 14 *n.*
Macomb, Ill., Lincoln at, IV, 294; ambrotype, 294.
McCormick, Andrew, I, 154 *n.*
McCormick, Cyrus Hall, reaper, II, 278.
McCormick *vs.* Manny, reaper case, II, 278.
McCown, John, I, 199.
McCrery, James, I, 95 *n.*
McCulloch, Hugh, I, 38.
McDaniel, Jonathan, III, 279.
McDougal, ——, I, 35 *n.*
McDowell, James, Southern fears, III, 17 *n.*
McIlvaine, Abraham R., II, 107 *n.*
McIntosh, ——, burning of, I, 220, 227, 228.
McIntyre, D. T., Matson case, II, 100.
Mackay, Alexander, 'Western World,' III, 3 *n.*; Southern manners, 8, 12 *n.*; planters, 10 *n.*; slavery, 15 *n.*; war of races, 58.
Mackay, Charles, the 'Enquiry,' II, 228 *n.*
McLean, John, II, 138 *n.*, 144 *n.*, 302, 307; III, 143 *n.*, 357 *n.*; IV, 165 *n.*; reaper case, II, 283, 286; higher law, III, 112; Phillips on, IV, 34; Dred Scott, 99, 105, 107; political activities, 99; described, 112; decision, 122.
McLean County, tax case, II, 287.
McMillan, Robert, I, 268.
McMillen, James A., I, 21 *n.*
McNamar, John, I, 145; election at New Salem, 109; aids Lincoln, 115; store-keeper, 126; Ann Rutledge, 146; story of, 147; returns to New York, 148; suspicions of, 149; arrives at New Salem, 150.
McNeely, W., I, 127 *n.*
McNeil, John, I, 147. *See* McNamar.
McRoberts, Samuel, Senator, I, 286.
Macon, Ga., III, 123.
Macon County, Ill., II, 251; Lincolns in, I, 104, 108 *n.*
Mad-stone, II, 229.
Madden, Richard Robert, III, 36 *n.*
Madison, Dorothy Payne (Todd), II, 106, 158.
Madison, James, I, 1; slave trade, III, 34 *n.*; slave-holder, 54; representation, 61.
'Madison' letters, II, 7.
Mails, II, 182 *n.*; III, 283 *n.*; Vandalia, I, 161.
Maine, Georgia protest, I, 247; liquor law, 249 *n.*; III, 228, 293; negroes, IV, 236.
Mann, Horace, II, 142 *n.*
Manny, John H., reaper, II, 279.
Mannypenny, G. W., on Reeder, III, 318 *n.*
Marcy, William Learned, I, 130; IV, 118; on abolition societies, I, 192; Kansas, III, 331.
Marine Bank, Springfield, II, 200 *n.*
Marion, Mo., Synod against abolition, I, 220 *n.*
Marryat, Frederick, III, 161.
Marriage, loose views on, III, 64.
Marsh, Matthew S., on Petersburg, III, 132 *n.*; Lincoln as postmaster, 142.
Marsh, Sylvester, II, 301 *n.*
Marshall, Humphrey, slavery and disunion, III, 118.
Marshall, John, I, 261 *n.*; III, 7; Jefferson's policy, I, 2; slave-holder, III, 54.
Marshall, Samuel, II, 59 *n.*
Marshall, Samuel D., II, 261.
Marshall, Samuel Scott, III, 273 *n.*
Marshall, Thomas Riley, IV, 276 *n.*
Martin, Martha Denny, III, 165.
Martin, Robert, III, 165.
Martineau, Harriet, writings on America, III, 9 *n.*; New Orleans, 10; Mobile, 10; Southern character, 13; miscegenation, 23 *n.*, 26; slaves worked to death, 37 *n.*; patience of slave owners, 37 *n.*; kind treatment, 38.
Maryland, III, 79; emancipation, 32 *n.*, 109.
Mason, George, slave-holder, III, 54, 87; centralization, 62.
Mason, James Murray, III, 90; career, 87; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 202; Sumner, 344; at Bunker Hill, IV, 54.
Mason, John Young, IV, 31.
Mason City, Ill., II, 264.
Mason County, II, 63.
Massachusetts, III, 93; Lincoln visits, II, 166; Whig divisions, 167; Free-Soil Party, 167; Whig Convention, 176; secession petitions, III, 75; emigrant aid society, 299; assault on Sumner, 352.
Masters, Thomas D., I, viii.
Matheny, Charles Reynolds, II, 10.
Matheny, James Harvey, I, 209 *n.*, 255 *n.*; II, 28, 148 *n.*; Lincoln's humor, 1; religion, 4 *n.*; Lincoln's gloom, 18, 19; wedding, 58, 59; against Republican, IV, 21, 40; Trumbull-Lincoln deal, 285.
Matheny, Noah, II, 47.
Mather, Otis May, I, vii, 11 *n.*

Mather, Richard, of Hardin County, I, 24.
Mather, Thomas, I, 196.
Matheson, James, III, 47, 48 *n.*; emancipation, 14 *n.*
Matson, James, II, 101 *n.*
Matson, Robert, case of, II, 95.
Matteson, Joel Aldrich, II, 293 *n.*; III, 196, 297; IV, 139; for Senate, III, 283; Kansas, IV, 47.
Mattoon, Ill., IV, 311.
May, Charles Augustus, II, 158.
May, Samuel Joseph, III, 136 *n.*; on Webster, 128; on Union, 133; IV, 90.
Meade, Richard Kidder, III, 73.
Mease, Pierce, III, 5 *n.*
Mechanicsburg, Ill., I, 138; II, 197.
Medill, Joseph, IV, 195; on Whitney's version, 11; Buchanan, 190; Douglas, 197; objects to question, 295.
Melton, Charles, I, 26.
Men created equal, I, 74. *See* Equality.
Menard County, Ill., I, 132 *n.*; II, 6 *n.*, 63, 180 *n.*; candidate, 5.
Mentelle, Waldemar de, II, 11 *n.*
Mentelle, Madame, II, 11.
Mercer County, Ky., I, 14 *n.*
Merryman, Elias H., I, 210; II, 8 *n.*, 84; Lincoln-Shields affair, 48; insults Whiteside, 55, 56.
Merryman, James H., II, 49 *n.*
Merryman, William F. N., II, 49 *n.*
Merservy, W. S., II, 43 *n.*
Merwin, J. B., Lincoln and prohibition, III, 295 *n.*
Meserve, Frederick Hill, I, x.
Methodist Church, Foster on, III, 24; split on slavery, 56, 90, 96.
Metzker, James Preston, murder of, II, 264.
Mexico, II, 167; III, 110; IV, 318; war with, II, 78, 79; III, 106; message on, II, 111; origin of war, 112; constitution, 114; slavery abolished, 115; military caste, 115; defence of, 117; peace, 130; annexation, III, 248 *n.*; IV, 170; destiny, 29.
Michaux, François André, I, 38; the Barrens, Ky., 4; Muldraugh's Hill, 26 *n.*
Michigan Central R.R., II, 288.
Miles, John, I, 16 *n.*
Militia meeting, Ind., I, 79; trainings, III, 158.
Milk sickness, I, 47, 48 *n.*, 94.
Mill, near Posey's, I, 46.
Mill Creek farm, Ky., I, 23, 26.
Miller, James, IV, 8 *n.*
Miller, Joseph, I, 218 *n.*
Miller, Joshua, I, 135 *n.*
Miller, William, I, 121.
Miller, ——, I, 217.
Miller's Big Spring, Ky., I, 10.
Milwaukee, II, 197 *n.*
Minges, Peter, I, 34 *n.*
Minnesota, III, 108, 251.
Miscegenation, charges, III, 23, 52; in colonies and States, IV, 117.
Mississippi, III, 143, 144; resolutions on Abolitionists, I, 191; mobs, 228; Ingraham on, III, 11; slave parties, 40; Nashville Convention, 92; slavery, 189.
Mississippi River, removing snags, II, 156.
Missouri, Illinois deposits in banks, I, 242; slave breeding, III, 47; emancipation, 109; Kansas and, 258, 312; slavery, 268; fears of Kansas emigrants, 301; secret societies, 303; border conditions, 313; court against Dred Scott, IV, 94, 120.
Missouri Compromise, III, 84, 151, 185, 189, 251; extension of line to Pacific, II, 155; III, 68; disavowed, 100; not harmful, 108; an issue, 172; repeal of, 172, 178, 199, 245, 247, 274; IV, 57; unconstitutional, 83, 106, 120, 142; question to be tested, 96, 98; Stephens on, 101; McLean on, 122; restoration, 251.
Mitchell, David William, negroes in England, III, 36; freedmen, 50.
Mobile, Ala., Martineau on, III, 10; Stuart-Wortley, 11; Union meeting, 124.
Mobs, condemned, I, 226; Lincoln's speech, 227.
Moffett, John B., II, 258 *n.*
Monk, Maria, III, 227 *n.*
Monroe, James, slave-holder, III, 54.
Montgomery, ——, III, 308.
Montgomery, William, I, 10.
Montgomery, Blakely and, I, 18 *n.*
Montgomery, Ala., Buford's company, III, 333.
Moore, Christina, II, 266 *n.*
Moore, C. H., II, 257 *n.*
Moore, George, II, 266 *n.*
Moore, John, IV, 267.
Moore, Matilda (Johnston), I, 61 *n.*
Moore, Peter, II, 266 *n.*
Morall, Albert, III, 333 *n.*
Morehead, Charles Slaughter, II, 152 *n.*
Morgan, Arthur E., I, 15 *n.*
Morgan County, II, 308.
Mormons, II, 41; III, 236, 315.
Morris, Buckner Smith, II, 301 *n.*
Morris, Martin M., II, 63.
Morrison, Don, II, 93, 194 *n.*
Morse, John Torrey, Jr., I, viii.
Mortality, *see* Knox.
Morton, Oliver Perry, III, 356 *n.*
Muddy Point, Ill., Thomas Lincoln at, I, 108 *n.*
Mud-sills, IV, 317.
Muldraugh's Hill, Ky., I, 26; road, 35.
Muncie, Ill., IV, 65.
Munsell, William A., I, 279 *n.*
Murat, Napoléon Achille, 'America,' III, 8.
Murphy, Richard, I, 245; license bill, 288.
Murr, J. Edward, on Nancy Hanks, I, 15 *n.*; Thomas Lincoln, 43 *n.*
'My Old Kentucky Home,' I, 19 *n.*

Naper, Joseph, license bill, I, 268.
Napoleon, in 1809, I, 2; Phillips on, III, 269; voting, IV, 179.
Nashville, Tenn., Convention, III, 71, 92, 99, 116, 120.
Natchez, Union meeting, III, 119; disunion meeting, 123.
Natick Resolutions, III, 26 *n.*
National Era, II, 105; III, 19 *n.*; mobbed, IV, 78.
National Hotel, Vandalia, I, 160 *n.*
National Intelligencer, II, 4, 104; III, 72, 160.
Nation's song, IV, 64.
Naudain, Arnold, I, 210 *n.*
Navigation law and slave trade, III, 34 *n.*
Neale, Thomas M., surveyor, I, 143.
Nebraska, III, 166, 168; organization, 169, 307; delegates, 174; protest against bill, 221; slavery, 250.
Negroes, vote, II, 188; equality, III, 28; IV, 143, 152, 319; in Africa, III, 33, 48; slaves, 34; in-

feriority, 34; happiness in slavery, 35; as citizens, IV, 117, 123, 315, 331; rights, 117.
'Neighborhood broil,' I, 64.
Nelson, ——, Dr., I, 209.
Nelson, Gustavus Edward, I, 148 *n.*
Nelson, Samuel, III, 143 *n.*; Dred Scott, IV, 99, 104; described, 114.
Nelson County, Ky., I, 11 *n.*
New England, responsible for slavery, III, 33; clergy against Nebraska bill, 221; emigrant aid company, 300.
New Mexico, II, 183; III, 79, 190; slavery in, 79, 177, 193, 251; IV, 339.
New Orleans, La., Lincoln's voyages, I, 87, 105; Martineau, III, 10; negro Saturnalia, 40.
New Orleans Picayune, III, 93.
New Salem, Ill., II, 2; stranding of boat, I, 106; Lincoln at, 108; II, 203, 271; election, I, 108; stores of, 126; post office, 131; decline of, 132 *n.*
New York, resolutions on Abolitionists, I, 191; slave insurrection, III, 27 *n.*; cruelty to wives, 44 *n.*; riots, 50; freedmen and votes, 51; liquor law, 293 *n.*; negroes, IV, 236.
New York Courier and Enquirer, disunion, III, 77.
Newbern, slave insurrection, III, 27 *n.*
Newhall family, II, 229.
Niagara Falls, Lincoln on, II, 179.
Nicholson, Alfred Osborn Pope, III, 184 *n.*
Nicolay, John George, IV, 195.
Nolin Baptist Church, I, 37 *n.*
Nolin Creek, Ky., I, 4, 10.
Norfolk, Va., slaves owning slaves, III, 42.
Norris, James H., II, 264.
Norris, Moses, attacks Sumner, III, 204.
North, labor conditions, III, 44; IV, 78; South and, III, 65, 218.
North Carolina, emancipation, III, 109.
Northern Indiana R.R., II, 288.
Northern man, Southern principles, III, 197, 210.
Northern party, III, 218.
Norton, Jesse Olds, III, 273 *n.*
Nott, Samuel, on Taney, IV, 129 *n.*
Nourse, Amos, IV, 265 *n.*
Nueces River, II, 119, 126, 127, 151.
Nullification, I, 101, 128.

Oakland, Me., II, 96.
Oath, secrecy, bank, I, 200.
Observer, Lovejoy's, I, 219; III, 20 *n.*
Offut, Denton, New Orleans venture, I, 105; store of, 108; wager, 111; mill, 113; disappears, 114.
Oglesby, Richard James, II, 79 *n.*
Ohio, III, 270; senatorial election, 212; slavery, 268; campaign, IV, 339.
Ohio Life and Trust Co., IV, 161 *n.*
Old Buck, horse, II, 204.
Old, old Sukey, I, 136.
Old Soldier, campaign newspaper, I, 273 *n.*; II, 151.
Oldham, Todd and Co., II, 248.
Olds, Francis A., State contracts, I, 286.
Oliphant, E. P., verses on *Talisman*, I, 119 *n.*
Oliver, Mordecai, Kansas committee, III, 339; IV, 43.
Oliver, William, health of Vandalia, I, 161 *n.*
Olmsted, Frederick Law, 'Journey,' III, 6 *n.*; Richmond and Charleston, 12; slave labor, 15 *n.*, 45 *n.*; miscegenation, 24 *n.*; nigger killer, 38 *n.*; overseers and drivers, 38 *n.*; tasks, 39 *n.*; negro Saturnalia, 40; freed slaves, 41; slave earnings, 43 *n.*; slave breeding, 47; negro improved, 49; morality, 52 *n.*; Southern conservatism, 66.
Oneida Perfectionists, III, 65.
Onstot, Henry, I, 106 *n.*, 121 *n.*, 131; tavern, 151.
Onstot, Thompson Gaines, I, 136, 141, 142; on Mary Todd, II, 15; Shields, 39; Lincoln-Herndon partnership, 67; IV, 229.
Ordinance of 1787, Northwest territory, III, 189, 245, 268; IV, 16.
Oregon, II, 85, 121, 154; III, 103, 107, 108, 167; IV, 302; Lincoln for governor, II, 195; slavery, III, 193.
Orgmathorial court, II, 236, 262.
Ormsbee, Joseph W., on independent treasury, I, 281.
Orr, James Lawrence, III, 352 *n.*; slavery and law, IV, 142, 295 *n.*; Kansas, 165 *n.*
Osawatomie, battle of, IV, 46.
Osborne, William Henry, II, 292, 296 *n.*
Osgood, Uri, III, 279.
Ostend Manifesto, IV, 31.
Ottawa, Ill., joint debate, IV, 283.
Ouverture, Toussaint l', III, 29.
Overseers, plantation, III, 38.
Owens, Mary, II, 4, 14; visits New Salem, I, 144, 154; described, 145; attentions of Lincoln, 154; letters to, 155; Lincoln's explanation, 156; her version, 158.

Pace, Harvey T., I, 242.
Pacific Railroad, III, 166, 169; IV, 32, 173.
Pain, John, IV, 21.
Paine, Thomas, Age of Reason, I, 138.
Pakenham, Sir Richard, Calhoun to, II, 118.
Palfrey, John Gorham, II, 170, 183; in Congress, 109; vote withheld, 111 *n.*; *Pearl* inquiry, 142; Free-Soil Party, 169.
Palmer, A. S., IV, 63.
Palmer, John McAuley, II, 94, 254 *n.*, 308; III, 240; IV, 195 *n.*; Lincoln's letter, III, 240; anti-Nebraska, 279; party, IV, 4; Bloomington Convention, 7; foreign policy, 29; favors Lincoln, 37.
Panic, financial, 1837, I, 167, 232; 1857, II, 295; IV, 68, 160, 276.
Pantier, D. H., I, 121 *n.*
Pappsville speech, I, 124.
Park, George, II, 290 *n.*
Parker, Charles E., II, 269.
Parker, Elizabeth, II, 12.
Parker, Elizabeth (Porter), II, 12.
Parker, James, II, 143.
Parker, Robert, II, 12.
Parker, Theodore, II, 105 *n.*; Herndon and, III, 19; IV, 191 *n.*; Fugitive Slave Law, III, 27, 126, 131; on Webster, 128; Bible and slavery, 133; prediction, 355 *n.*; South and Union, IV, 90; Dred Scott decision, 135; on Douglas, 183; democracy defined, 189; house-divided speech, 224; Lincoln's evasion, 294.
Parker, Wilson and, of Lexington, Ky., I, 20 *n.*
Parker Brothers, of Lexington, Ky., I, 20 *n.*
Parkinson, Robert H., II, 279, 285 *n.*
Parks, Samuel Conant, II, 253 *n.*; Lincoln's honesty, 245.
Parkville, Mo., III, 315.
Parrish, John, IV, 214 *n.*

Parsons, Charles C., III, 130 *n.*
Parsons, Charles Grandison, evils of slavery, III, 22; Dread, 29.
Pate, Samuel, I, 85.
Patrollers in Kentucky, I, 13.
Patronage, Illinois, II, 191.
Patten, William W., III, 224 *n.*
Patterson *vs.* Edwards, II, 277 *n.*
Patton, Charles Lanphier, I, viii.
Patton, William Lanphier, I, viii; II, 200 *n.*, 203 *n.*
Paulding, James Kirke, at Rochester, II, 35; defence of South, III, 30; negro inferiority, 35; happiness of slaves, 41; free negroes and votes, 51 *n.*, 58.
Pauper, tyrant, of South, III, 21.
Pawnee City, Kas., III, 308, 317, 337; IV, 6.
Pearce, James Alfred, IV, 217 *n.*
Pearl, II, 142.
Pease, Theodore Calvin, I, viii; Browning's diary, IV, 10 *n.*
Pease, William W., II, 28 *n.*
Peay, Mrs., II, 24.
Peck, Ebenezer, II, 45.
Peck, John Mason, Rev., II, 135.
Pekin, Ill., II, 62, 290.
Pence, Lafayette Stiles, I, viii; Abraham Lincoln's death, 11; on Lucy Hanks, 14 *n.*
Pendleton, John Strother, young Indian, II, 136 *n.*
Pennsylvania, III, 270; political situation, II, 165; disunion petition, III, 75; runaway slave, 145; at Chicago, IV, 351.
Peonage, Mexico, II, 115.
People *vs.* Patterson, II, 250 *n.*
People's party, IV, 24.
Peoria, Ill., II, 197; IV, 283 *n.*; Lincoln's speech, III, 244, 267.
Perkins, J. N., II, 296 *n.*
Peru, Ill., IV, 284.
Petersburg, Ill., I, 132 *n.*; II, 5, 253; convention, 77.
Petitions, slavery, I, 247; liquor, 249.
Pettit, John, Kansas-Nebraska bill, III, 203; ministers' protest, 221.
Philadelphia, riots, III, 50; Know-Nothing mayor, 226; Republican Convention, 356.
Phillips, D. C., IV, 56 *n.*
Phillips, Isaac Newton, Whitney's version, IV, 12 *n.*
Phillips, Ulrich Bonnell, overworked slaves, III, 37 *n.*; extra pay, 39 *n.*; cost of slave labor, 45 *n.*; training of negro, 49 *n.*; house-divided references, IV, 214 *n.*
Phillips, Wendell, II, 169 *n.*; III, 19 *n.*, 83; IV, 162 *n.*; on Lovejoy murder, I, 226; Lincoln, slave hound, II, 185; miscegenation, III, 24; Fugitive Slave Law, 27, 132; disunionist, 75; IV, 90; attack on Webster, III, 128, 129; slave arming, 133; 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 138; Sims, 145 *n.*; Napoleon, 269; Thayer's scheme, 300; on McLean, IV, 34; Republican Party, 53.
Pierce, Edward Lillie, Lincoln in Worcester, II, 112.
Pierce, Franklin, II, 137; III, 155; IV, 25, 62, 66, 308; nominated, III, 148; Douglas on, 153; Lincoln on, 158, 160; elected, 162; politically inept, 165; Missouri Compromise repeal, 182; vetoes, 230 *n.*; IV, 32; Kansas message, III, 331, 336; on election, IV, 82; compromise unconstitutional, 83; retirement, 83.
Pierpont, John, 'Anti-Slavery Poems,' III, 21 *n.*, 28 *n.*
Pigeon Creek, Ind., life on, I, 50.
Pigeon Creek Baptist Church, I, 71, 96.
Pike, James Shepherd, III, 360 *n.*; disunion, IV, 92; Dred Scott, 98, 99 *n.*, 104, 110; on Campbell, 114; Taney, 115; slave power, 127 *n.*
Pike House, Bloomington, IV, 3.
Pillow, Gideon Johnson, II, 73; III, 122; career, 122 *n.*
Pillsbury, Parker, III, 56 *n.*; IV, 162 *n.*; disunion, 91.
Pitcher, John, of Rockport, Ind., I, 77, 82, 90.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Free-Soil Convention, III, 156; Republican, 356.
Planters of the South, III, 3; wives, 10.
Poe's 'Raven,' II, 22, 164.
Poems, Lincoln's, I, 64; II, 87.
Poinsett, Joel Roberts, plantation, III, 39 *n.*; unionist, 145.
Polecat, verses on, II, 86.
Polk, James Knox, II, 89, 180 *n.*; III, 107; nominated, II, 69; messages on Mexico, 79, 111; Oregon, 85; levees, 106; attack on administration, 111, 119; war and slavery, 122; Lincoln's speech, 131; candidacy, 144.
Pollock, James, II, 107 *n.*
Polly's son, III, 297.
Polygamy, among slaves, III, 52; issue, 236.
Pope, John, I, 19 *n.*
Pope, Nathaniel, on Butterfield, II, 193.
Pope, Worden, I, 19 *n.*, 35.
Popular sovereignty, III, 176, 255; IV, 140, 232, 237, 240.
Porter, Andrew, II, 12.
Porter, Elizabeth, II, 12.
Porter, Elizabeth (Parker), II, 12.
Porto Rico, III, 248 *n.*
Posey, Francis, I, 39, 42, 44.
Postage, I, 149 *n.*
Post office, II, 182 *n.*, 202 *n.*
Postville, Logan Co., II, 234.
Powell, Beverly, II, 58.
Powell, William H., IV, 8 *n.*
Preachers, Southern, denounced, III, 25, 49.
Prentice, George Denison, I, 97 *n.*
Presbyterian Church, division, III, 57, 90.
Press, freedom of the, Kentucky on, I, 190; Connecticut, 191.
Prescott, William Hickling, III, 130 *n.*
Preston, William Ballard, II, 152 *n.*; young Indian, 136 *n.*
Price, Sterling, IV, 61.
Prigg, Edward, case, III, 67 *n.*, 98, 104, 109, 111, 126.
Primm, James, II, 256 *n.*, 293 *n.*
Primrose, William, I, 215 *n.*
Prince, Ezra Morton, II, 252 *n.*, 255; Lincoln's fee, 293 *n.*, 295.
Prince, Morton, on Lincoln's mental trouble, II, 18 *n.*
Princeton, Ill., III, 271; IV, 65.
Pringle, Edward, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' III, 140.
Printer, public, Illinois, I, 291.
Prior, James, 'Life of Burke,' II, 223 *n.*
'Pro-Slavery Argument,' III, 18 *n.*
Profanity, I, 52.
Property, representation, III, 60.
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph, III, 64.
Pryor, Mrs. Roger Atkinson, IV, 174 *n.*

Pugh, George Ellis, IV, 178 *n.*, 199 *n.*
Pugh, Jonathan H., I, 126 *n.*
Pulszky, Francis, III, 38 *n.*, 46 *n.*
Pulszky, Theresa, III, 38 *n.*, 47 *n.*; Southern conservatism, 65 *n.*; the West, 107 *n.*; Shields, 113.
Purity of Southern women, III, 53.
Purple, Norman Higgins, II, 294.
Putnam, Harvey, resolution, II, 138.
Putnam County, Ill., anti-slavery society, I, 194 *n.*

Quilting bees, I, 55.
Quincy, debate at, IV, 321.
Quindaro, Kas., III, 307 *n.*
Quinn, James, 'Jests,' I, 83.
Quitman, John Anthony, II, 158.

Race, question of, II, 187; III, 202.
Radford, Reuben, I, 126, 143 *n.*, 245 *n.*; store wrecked, 127.
Railroads, early, I, 116; in Illinois, 174, 237.
Ralston, James H., abolition protests, I, 192.
'Ram on facts,' II, 274 *n.*
Ramsey, Silas, III, 271.
Randolph, Beverly, I, 9.
Randolph, J. Thornton, III, 140 *n.*
Rankin, Henry B., in Lincoln's office, II, 202 *n.*
Ray, Charles Henry, IV, 176 *n.*, 193 *n.*, 238, 277; Douglas and Republicans, 191 *n.*; Lincoln for Senate, 196.
Ray County, Mo., resolutions, III, 302 *n.*
Raymond, B. B., Fugitive Slave Law, III, 134.
Raymond, Henry Jarvis, IV, 350.
Rebecca letters, II, 40.
Rechabites, III, 228 *n.*
Red Shirts, Kansas, III, 334.
Redman, George, I, 34 *n.*, 36 *n.*
Redmond, George, I, 34 *n.*
Reed, Andrew, III, 48 *n.*; emancipation, 14 *n.*; slave breeding, 47.
Reed, James A., Lincoln's church attendance, II, 208 *n.*
Reed, John, I, 10 *n.*
Reed, Thomas Buck, I, 19 *n.*
Reeder, Andrew Horatio, III, 319; IV, 48; governor of Kansas, III, 307, 336, 337; buys land, 308; Lincoln's dislike, 309; IV, 6; election, III, 311; message, 317; dismissed, 318; charges against, 318; speech, 322; Senator, 331; indicted, 332; Bloomington Convention, IV, 6.
Reeves, O. T., on Lincoln, II, 240.
Reid, John W., IV, 46.
Religion, in Indiana, I, 52.
Remsburg, J. E., I, 76 *n.*
Republican Party, origin, II, 168 *n.*; III, 264; State Convention, 1854, 264; sectional, 355; National Convention, 1856, 356; IV, 24, 29; name avoided, 8; platform, 30; denounced, 51; women work for, 61; meetings, 62; banquet, 1856, 84; want of issue, 88; disunion, 91; favored, 92; Convention, 1858, 201; platform, 208; fusion with Douglas, 244; names and principles, 314; policy, 340; Campaign of 1860, 346; platform, 348.
Repudiation, Illinois and, I, 276, 283, 285, 287.
Reynolds, John, I, 109 *n.*, 120, 122, 163 *n.*; IV, 201, 266 *n.*; nullification, I, 129, 130 *n.*; at Vandalia, 178; internal improvements, 196 *n.*; on Lovejoy's journal, 221 *n.*; abolition, 224 *n.*
Rhett, Robert Barnwell, II, 184; in Congress, 110; address to Southern people, III, 122; secession speech, 123, 127; secessionist, 146; IV, 5.
Rhodes, Hannah, I, 34 *n.*
Rice, Nathan Lewis, III, 34 *n.*
Richardson, Joseph C., I, 80; 'Chronicles of Reuben,' 92.
Richardson, William Alexander, I, 165; III, 273 *n.*; IV, 152; baby, II, 154; Calhoun's proposition, III, 117; nomination, IV, 4; in Baltimore, 345.
Richmond, Va., Chevalier on, III, 7; Olmsted, 12; slave insurrection, 27 *n.*; slave parties, 40; Douglas's speech, 153.
Richmond Enquirer, III, 31.
Rickard, Sarah, Lincoln and, II, 20, 27, 34.
Riney, Zachariah, school teacher, I, 28.
Rio Grande, Texan boundary, II, 113, 126, 127, 151.
Ritchie, Thomas, II, 104 *n.*; III, 184 *n.*; on Rhett, 123; love of Union, 124.
River and Harbor Convention, II, 89; bill, 1854, III, 230, 240.
Rives, George Lockhart, II, 113 *n.*
Road, surveyor, I, 36 *n.*; Illinois, 161.
Robertson, George, III, 321.
Robinson, Charles, III, 319, 320, 327, 331; heads Kansas party, 306; election, 309; arrested, 332; IV, 5; house burnt, III, 335.
Robinson, Christopher, II, 291.
Robinson, John McCracken, I, 165.
Robinson, John Winter, IV, 180 *n.*
Roby, Anna C., I, 63, 80.
Rochester, Ill., Van Buren party, II, 35.
Rock Island Bridge case, II, 301; IV, 159.
Rockford, Ill., II, 279; III, 218 *n.*; IV, 306.
Rockingham County, Va., I, 7.
Rockport, Ind., school, I, 56 *n.*; library, 77 *n.*; size, 89.
Rod, divining, I, 61 *n.*
Rodman, J. H., of Hodgenville, Ky., I, 30.
Rollin, Charles, III, 65.
Rolling Fork, Ky., I, 26, 37.
Romine, Benjamin, I, 86.
Romine, Gideon W., I, 86.
Romine, John, I, 65; Abraham's laziness, 68.
Root, Joseph Mosley, II, 183 *n.*
Ross, Frederick Augustus, liberty or anarchy, III, 49.
Rough and Ready Club, II, 148.
Rowan, John, I, 19 *n.*
Royall, Anne, II, 105.
Rugg, Arthur Prentice, on Lincoln's visit to Massachusetts, II, 171 *n.*
Rumsey and Newcomb, minstrels, II, 239.
Rural Hotel, Springfield, I, 210.
Rusk, Thomas Jefferson, II, 134 *n.*
Russell, Le Baron, III, 342 *n.*
Russia, IV, 317, 319.
Rutherford, Hiram, II, 96, 97.
Rutledge, Ann, II, 16; described, I, 145; engaged to McNamar, 146; to Lincoln, 149; death, 150.
Rutledge, David Ham, I, 149, 150.
Rutledge, James, at New Salem, I, 109; sells to Lincoln, 127; tavern, 131, 145; farm, 148; death, 150.
Rutledge, Robert Brannon, I, 134, 140; on Ann Rutledge, 147; Lincoln's grief, 151.
Rutledge, William, on Ann Rutledge, I, 151.

Rutledge family, I, 145 *n.*

Sabine River, II, 114.
St. Anne's, Ill., II, 242.
St. Louis, Mo., II, 198 *n.*; mob violence, I, 220, 228; Rock Island Bridge, II, 302.
Salem, Ind., printing, I, 53 *n.*
Salt Creek, Ill., I, 164.
Salt River, Ky., I, 26.
Salters, Samuel F. M., III, 316 *n.*
Sampson's Ghost, I, 215.
Sams, Thomas M., III, 285.
Sand, George, *see* Dudevant.
Sandwich islands, III, 248 *n.*
Sand Ridge, I, 146.
Sanford, John F. A., Dred Scott, IV, 95, 135 *n.*
Sangamo Journal, Lincoln and, I, 212.
Sangamon County, I, 207; II, 63; representation, I, 176; division of, 183; law business, 211; appeal to Whigs, II, 70 *n.*; Whig decline, 148; in 1849, 198; representative, III, 278; prohibition, 296 *n.*; call, 360; ratification meeting, IV, 23; Buchanan carries, 70.
Sangamon County Lyceum, I, 208.
Sangamon River, Ill., I, 104; navigation, 114, 116.
San Jacinto, battle of, II, 81.
Santa Anna, Antonio Lopez de, II, 134, 149 *n.*; at San Jacinto, 81; compact, 82, 128; repudiated, 112; president, 115.
Santo Domingo, negro rule, I, 188; III, 36, 133; insurrection, 16; Ouverture, 29.
Saunders, George T., II, 264 *n.*, 273 *n.*
Sawyer, George S., III, 33 *n.*; overseers, 38 *n.*; slaves in churches, 48 *n.*; slave marriage, 52 *n.*
Sawyer, Seth T., I, 165 *n.*
Sayres, Edward, II, 142.
Scates, Walter Bennett, II, 290 *n.*; judge, I, 297 *n.*; Browning case, II, 199 *n.*
Schaff, Philip, negro question, III, 58.
Schneider, Christian, IV, 265.
Schneider, George, at Decatur, III, 358.
Schouler, William, Lincoln to, II, 166.
Schurz, Carl, IV, 273; Quincy debate, 324.
Scott, Dred, origin and marriage, IV, 93, 124; suit for freedom, 94; in Missouri courts, 94; in Federal courts, 95, 96; pamphlet, 96; Taney's decision, 117; other opinions, 121; lack of interest, 136; set free, 136, 155; Douglas on, 141; Lincoln, 155, 217, 313, 321; owners, 314, 323.
Scott, Harriet, IV, 93, 124.
Scott, Sir Walter, South and, III, 66.
Scott, William, 'Lessons in Elocution,' I, 75, 81.
Scott, Winfield, II, 144; III, 135, 160; nomination, 149; Douglas on, 153; Lincoln on, 155; Buchanan, IV, 27.
Scott case, II, 261.
Scott Club, Springfield, III, 154.
Scripps, John Lock, IV, 11, 18.
Sebastopol, in debates, IV, 237, 239.
Secession, movement for, III, 69.
Sectionalism, beginning, III, 164; rebuked, IV, 132.
Sedgwick, Elizabeth Dwight, III, 5 *n.*
Sedgwick, Ellery, I, viii.
Selby, Paul, III, 358.
Selden, Mrs., II, 136 *n.*
Semple, James, I, 182; described, 179.
Senator, IV, 282.
Severns Valley, I, 19.
Seward, William Henry, III, 111, 114, 125, 153, 156, 184, 196, 204, 213; IV, 56, 197; in Boston, II, 178; described, 178; III, 103; slavery, II, 179; speech on compromise measures, III, 103; fugitive slaves, 104; higher law, 105, 111, 160; Union, 105; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 197; admires Douglas, 209; ministers' protest, 221; against nativists, 224; admission of Kansas, 338; Massachusetts, 352; Republican leader, 353; IV, 33; free Kansas, 47; disunion, 91; charges conspiracy, 133; Taney and, 134; Lincoln and, 198; irrepressible conflict, 338; Brown's raid, 340; Chicago Convention, 346.
Shadrach [Frederick Jenkins], III, 145 *n.*
Shaler, Nathaniel Southgate, I, 4 *n.*
Shannon, Wilson, governor of Kansas, III, 325, 327 *n.*, 328, 331; IV, 44; removed, 61.
Sharp's rifles, III, 304 *n.*, 315, 333, 341; IV, 49; Beecher's Bibles, III, 330.
Shaw, J. Henry, II, 263 *n.*, 265.
Shaw, Lemuel, III, 143 *n.*
Shawnee mission, Kas., III, 316, 317.
Shawneetown, Ill., II, 261; Bank of Illinois, I, 166, 198, 203 *n.*; Alton Railroad, 198; bank fails, II, 37; notes, 38, 39, 42.
Sheahan, James Washington, IV, 205 *n.*, 226 *n.*, 228 *n.*; 'Chicago Times,' III, 230.
Shelbyville, Ill., II, 249.
Sheridan, Abraham, I, 34 *n.*
Sherman, John, Kansas committee, III, 339; IV, 43.
Shields, James, I, 293 *n.*; II, 8 *n.*, 137; III, 158, 196, 267 *n.*; IV, 152; described, I, 179; II, 38; III, 113; dances, I, 183; Lincoln's letter, 205 *n.*; bank bill, 236; auditor, 286; circular on bank notes, II, 38; Rebecca letters, 42; defends proclamation, 45; turns on Lincoln, 48; Butler and, 56; offices, 57; war with Mexico, 80; wounded, 94, 131; senator, 196; Dorman case, 261; compromise measures, III, 113; secession, 114; election of 1854, 274; Senate, 280, 282; defeat, 290; aids Douglas, 355 *n.*
Shonkwiler, Francis Marion, IV, 273 *n.*
Short, James, I, 131 *n.*, 146, 150, 151; pays Lincoln's debt, 143; II, 203; delegate, 64.
Sidner, Samuel, II, 258 *n.*
'Silk Merchant's Daughter,' I, 69.
Simms, William Gilmore, III, 18 *n.*; miscegenation, 23 *n.*; 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 139.
Sims, Thomas, III, 143, 145 *n.*
Singleton, James Washington, III, 266.
Sinking Spring farm, Ky., I, 3, 10 *n.*, 23, 41; purchase, 24.
Skinner, William C., II, 43 *n.*
Slater, John T., I, 12.
Slavery, II, 85; Thomas Lincoln, I, 33; South Fork church, 37 *n.*; Grimshaw's 'History,' 74; Lincoln's contact with, 88, 107; Illinois laws, 163; a sin, 188; III, 21, 53, 157; Lincoln-Stone protest, I, 194; Mexico, II, 115; extension of, 173; III, 68; IV, 259; Giddings on, II, 184; favored, III, 4; poor whites and, 5; small farmers, 5; middle class, 7; Southern feeling, 13, 32; natural condition, 15; discussion of, 31; origin, 33, 34; in Northern States, 34; IV, 118, 127; uplift, III, 48; Bible and, 55; conservative, 67; climate and, 101, 108, 176, 189, 193, 253; in colonies, IV, 117; municipal law, 123, 125, 252; in states, 220, 290; wrong, 317, 321; nationalizing, 318.

Slaves, Kentucky, I, 13; runaway, advertised, 163, 182; III, 26; improved conditions, I, 192; III, 14; abducted, I, 247; II, 184; on *Lebanon*, 24; discipline and regulation, III, 13, 15, 22, 37; class distinctions, 13; contentment, 14, 41; runaway, 15, 26, 41; increase, 15, 43; sale of, 15; breeding of, 16, 46; education, 23; religion, 23, 48; separation of families, 23, 51; insurrections, 27 *n.*; defects and despair, 29; trade, 33, 71 *n.*, 79, 86, 256; IV, 222; freed, III, 35, 41, 50; good treatment, 38, 43; extra work, 39; allowances and tasks, 39 *n.*; Saturnalia, 40; auctions, 40, 47; cruelty to, 42; earnings, 42; numbers in census, 43 *n.*; free laborers, 44; cost of labor, 45; crimes, 51; family ties, 52; marriages, 52 *n.*; citizens, 53 *n.*; representation and, 60, 257, 269; property, 85, 108; IV, 120, 311, 332; dealer, III, 254.
Slaves, fugitive, District of Columbia, II, 185; bill, III, 15; law, 27, 71 *n.*, 79, 100, 104, 109, 125, 126, 155, 205; Prigg decision, 67 *n.*, 98; Webster on, 98, 102; law of 1850, 126; Parker on, 131; defended, 136; execution, 136; for repeal, 142; agitation against, 143.
Sleds, use of, I, 42.
Slicer, Henry, Rev, II, 138 *n.*
Slidell, John, III, 87 *n.*; IV, 26; rejected by Mexico, II, 78.
Slocum, J. J., III, 227 *n.*
Small, John, I, 42.
Smith, Anne Maria (Todd), II, 10 *n.*, 248 *n.*
Smith, Caleb Blood, II, 152 *n.*, 186; in Congress, 109; war with Mexico, 120; at Chicago, IV, 351.
Smith, C. M., II, 10 *n.*
Smith, Gerrit, III, 19 *n.*, 31 *n.*, 184 *n.*; IV, 48.
Smith, James, Rev., II, 208.
Smith, James D., II, 258 *n.*
Smith, John M., III, 316 *n.*
Smith, Justin Harvey, II, 113 *n.*
Smith, Lisle, II, 145.
Smith, Oliver Hampton, I, 98 *n.*
Smith, Samuel B., III, 279 *n.*
Smith, Theophilus Washington, I, 295; IV, 234.
Smith, Truman, II, 152 *n.*; young Indian, 136 *n.*
Smith, W. L. G., III, 140 *n.*
Smith *vs.* Dunlap, II, 276 *n.*
Smith *vs.* Smith, II, 278 *n.*
Smoot, Coleman, I, 106 *n.*, 132; loan to Lincoln, 162.
Snodgrass, ——, I, 139.
Society, American Anti-Slavery, Union and Slavery, III, 28.
Sons of '76, III, 223.
Sons of Sires, III, 223.
Sons of Temperance, III, 228 *n.*
Soulé, Pierre, IV, 31 *n.*
South, the, abolition societies, I, 188; dark prospects, II, 187; seeds of war, III, 1; population, 1 *n.*; conservatism, 2, 64, 66; IV, 55; education, III, 3; social structure, 3; manners of, 7, 12, 22; attitude on slavery, 15; fear of slaves, 17; oligarchy, 21 *n.*; reply to Abolitionists, 29; demands, 59; IV, 343; National Government, III, 60; North and, 65; Clay's compromise, 81; sectional rule, IV, 53; quiet resolution, 79; new Territories, 170.
South Carolina, nullification movement, I, 128; secession, III, 143, 145, 147; eccentricities, 152; Sumner's attack, 343.
South Fork Baptist Church, Ky., I, 36, 37 *n.*
Southampton County, Va., III, 16, 18.
Southern Literary Messenger, III, 30; 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 139.
Southern Press, III, 122.
Southworth, Emma Dorothy Eliza Nevitte, II, 105 *n.*
Spalding, Rufus Paine, IV, 37.
Sparks, Jared, III, 130 *n.*
Sparrow, Betsy (Hanks), I, 15; Nancy Hanks, 15 *n.*; moves to Indiana, 45; death, 48, 73 *n.*
Sparrow, Henry, marries Lucy Hanks, I, 14 *n.*
Sparrow, Lucy (Hanks), I, 14 *n.*
Sparrow, Nancy, I, 15 *n.*
Sparrow, Thomas, I, 15; Nancy Hanks, 15 *n.*; moves to Indiana, 44, 45; death, 48, 73 *n.*
Speaker of House, contest, III, 72.
Speech, lecture on, II, 224.
Speeches, congressional, II, 133 *n.*, 150; III, 72.
Speed, Fanny (Henning), II, 33, 66 *n.*
Speed, James, II, 12 *n.*
Speed, James, Lincoln's associations, II, 22.
Speed, John, II, 12 *n.*, 22 *n.*
Speed, Mrs. John, II, 22; gift of Bible, 24.
Speed, Joshua Fry, I, 255 *n.*, 273 *n.*; II, 1, 8 *n.*, 33, 88, 259 *n.*; Lincoln's skepticism, I, 140; Lincoln's speech, 154; receives Lincoln, 208; II, 201; literary society in rooms, 2; gatherings in store, 2; Lincoln's mind, 3; Byron, 3; Lincoln's religion, 4 *n.*; Edwards family, 12; origin, 12 *n.*; Matilda Edwards, 13 *n.*; Lincoln's engagement, 15; letter to Drake, 16; Lincoln's gloom, 17; moves to Louisville, 20; Lincoln's visit, 20, 21; courtship, 23, 26; hypochondria, 25; marriage, 33, 57; office, 190; slavery, III, 321.
Speed, Lucy Gilmer (Fry), II, 12 *n.*
Speed, Mary, II, 22; Lincoln's letter, 23.
Spencer, Ichabod, III, 136.
Spencer, ——, II, 258 *n.*
Spencer County, I, 40 *n.*; library, 77 *n.*; Lincoln's verses, II, 87.
Spink, Peter, II, 242.
Spooner, Thomas, III, 357 *n.*
Spot resolutions, Lincoln's, II, 125, 135.
Spotswood, G. W., I, 210, 211 *n.*
Sprague *vs.* Ill. River R.R. Co., II, 276 *n.*
Spriggs, Mrs., boarding house, Washington, II, 101, 141.
Spring Creek, Ill., I, 105.
Springfield, Ill., I, 105; II, 249; IV, 255; removal of capital, I, 174, 175, 195, 198, 199, 204, 205, 234, 245, 268, 276; State bank, 166, 170, 198; rejoicing, 206; in 1837, 207; dinner, 210; mob outbreak, 227 *n.*; first session of legislature, 256; reincorporation, 268; State House guarantee, 290; social center, II, 1; lyceum, 2 *n.*; cotillion, 8 *n.*; Taylor campaign, 148; mechanics, against Lincoln, 194; in 1849, 197; Scott Club, III, 154; Fillmore in, 238; Republican Convention, 264; IV, 201, 207; sale of liquor, III, 295; ratification meeting, IV, 21; Democratic meeting, 69; Democratic Convention, 192, 201.
Springfield Fire and Marine Co., II, 200 *n.*, 295.
Squatter Sovereignty, III, 312. *See* under Douglas.
Stanton, Benjamin, IV, 103.
Stanton, Edwin McMasters, reaper case, II, 280; opposes Lincoln, 286.

Stapp, Wyatt B., internal improvements, I, 265; license bill, 269.
State, loyalty to, III, 63, 112, 347; speaking offensively of, 346.
Stearns, Edward Josiah, III, 140.
Steiner, Bernard, IV, 95 *n.*; on McLean, 122 *n.*
Stephens, Alexander Hamilton, II, 111 *n.*, 126, 131, 150, 153 *n.*, 195; III, 31, 217; in Congress, II, 109; speech, 132; young Indian, 136, 144; Taylor's candidacy, 144 *n.*; address of South, 187, 189 *n.*; III, 70; on Hammond, 23 *n.*; slavery, 42, 67; centralization, 62; Thirty-first Congress, 71; disunion, 74; Abolitionists, 200 *n.*; Dred Scott, IV, 101, 104; Douglas's opposition, 177 *n.*
Stephenson, Nathaniel Wright, Texas and the Mexican War, II, 113 *n.*
Stevens, Frank Everett, Lincoln's protest on slavery, I, 195 *n.*
Stevens, Mabel, I, 36 *n.*
Stevens, Thaddeus, politics of Pennsylvania, II, 165; Southern gasconade, III, 74.
Stevenson, Adlai Ewing, II, 293.
Stevenson, B. F., II, 269.
Stevenson, Samuel, of Elizabethtown, Ky., I, 18 *n.*
Stewart, James Augustus, on McLean, IV, 100 *n.*
Stewart, J. G., Lincoln's appearance, II, 207.
Stiles, Charles Wardell, hookworm in South, III, 4 *n.*
Still, William, III, 27 *n.*
Stillman's defeat, I, 121.
Stockton, Robert Field, II, 139 *n.*
Stone, Daniel, I, 154 *n.*, 237, 297 *n.*; abolition protest, 192, 194, 206.
Story, Joseph, Prigg case, III, 67, 126.
Stout, Thomas, I, 34 *n.*
Stout, ——, II, 308.
Stowe, Calvin Ellis, III, 137.
Stowe, Harriet Beecher, I, 223 *n.*; II, 105 *n.*; 'Dred,' III, 29; 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 137, 227 *n.*; ministers' protest, 221.
Strange, Ignatius, I, 34 *n.*
Strawn, William, IV, 47 *n.*
Stringfellow, Benjamin Franklin, III, 310, 320, 332; on emigrant societies, 303; Kansas, 309, 311, 314 *n.*; election, 309 *n.*; Squatter Sovereign, 312.
Strohm, John, II, 107 *n.*
Stuart, Charles E., IV, 178 *n.*
Stuart, John Todd, I, 124 *n.*, 140, 162, 164, 173, 175, 270, 272; II, 101, 149, 196 *n.*, 220, 233 *n.*, 257, 290; III, 149 *n.*; advises Lincoln, I, 133, 137; described, 178; Lincoln's law partner, 209; II, 20; for Congress, I, 211, 255; in Adams case, 214; defeats Douglas, 255; Harrison campaign, 274; Lincoln's religion, II, 4 *n.*; Todd connection, 10; Henry's appointment, 18; renomination, 19; Lincoln's marriage, 59; melancholy, 228 *n.*; Sangamon call, III, 360; against Republican Party, IV, 21, 40.
Stuart, Moses, III, 56.
Stuart and Dummer, I, 209.
Stuart and Lincoln, I, 209; law business, 211 *n.*
Stuart-Wortley, Lady Emmeline, 'Travels,' III, 8; Mobile, 10.
Stump speaking in Indiana, I, 98 *n.*
Sub-Treasury, *see* Independent Treasury.
Suffrage, Lincoln on, II, 234.
Sullivan, Patrick, II, 251.
Sullivan *vs.* the People, II, 251 *n.*
Sumner, Charles, II, 175; III, 19 *n.*, 157, 181, 320 *n.*; described, II, 167; III, 340; Free-Soil policy, II, 168; fugitive slave bill, III, 132; election to Senate, 140, 210, 212; appeal of independent Democrats, 184; Douglas's reply, 188; Kansas-Nebraska speech, 196; Norris's attack, 204; shunned, 213; aroused North, 218; Kansas migration, 300; crime against Kansas, 339; IV, 47; Brooks's assault, III, 339, 348, 375; attacks Butler and Douglas, 342; election, IV, 112.
Sumner, Edwin Vose, Kansas, IV, 44, 45.
Sunderland, Le Roy, tract on slavery, I, 188 *n.*
Superstitions, Indiana, I, 50.
Supreme Court, Illinois, conversion, I, 292.
Supreme Court, U.S., II, 61; IV, 57, 253 *n.*; Dred Scott, 96, 290, 318; warned, 103; opening, 111; criticisms, 125, 202; conspiracy, 127, 133, 256, 292, 301, 308, 313; defended, 131, 234.
Surveyor, road, I, 36 *n.*; fees, 132 *n.*
Suttle, Charles T., Burns's case, III, 219.
Swaney, *see* Sweeney.
Swartwout, Samuel, defalcation, I, 241.
Sweeney, William, school, I, 56 *n.*, 63, 64.
Swett, Leonard, II, 206, 222, 250, 255 *n.*; described, 218; on Lincoln, 224; drinking, 237; Chicago Convention, IV, 315.
Sydney, Edward William, *see* Beverly Tucker.

Talbott, Benjamin, I, 213, 217 *n.*
Taliaferro, Laurence, IV, 93.
Talisman, I, 118, 206; II, 68.
Tammany Hall, Douglas and, IV, 230.
Taney, Alice, IV, 116.
Taney, Roger Brooke, II, 138 *n.*; fugitive slave, III, 67; Dred Scott decision, IV, 105, 108, 110, 117; described, 114; not slave-holder, 116; on Scott's lawyers, 120; Greeley on, 125; supplement, 126 *n.*; attacked, 127; calmness, 129; Nott and, 129 *n.*; defended, 132; Seward and, 134.
Tariff, II, 119; protective, IV, 163, 210, 351.
Taylor, Bayard, II, 105.
Taylor, Edmund D., III, 267.
Taylor, Green B., I, 65, 84 *n.*
Taylor, James, I, 84, 94 *n.*
Taylor, Nathaniel, III, 136.
Taylor, Zachary, I, 124 *n.*; II, 132 *n.*; III, 116 *n.*, 128; rumored retreat, II, 78; war with Mexico, 84, 113; thanks, 126; for president, 136, 144; qualifications, 145; songs, 148, 149; Lincoln's advice, 152; speech, 159; in South, 166; Webster and, 170; as candidate, 175; vote in Massachusetts, 178 *n.*; elected, 180; votes, 180 *n.*; inauguration, 190; patronage, 192, 195; plantation of son, III, 11; Union, 76.
Tazewell Co., Ill., IV, 288, 291.
Teillard, Dorothy Lamon, II, 220 *n.*
Telescope, I, 97.
Temperance movement, I, 249; III, 227; Lincoln's address, II, 28.
Templars of Honour, III, 228 *n.*
Tennessee, Whig prospects, II, 166; emancipation, III, 109; Nashville Convention, 121; slavery, 189.
Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, I, 2 *n.*
Terre Haute, Ind., IV, 311.
Territorial Register, III, 308, 328 *n.*; IV, 20 *n.*
Territories, extension of slavery, III, 68; in

Clay's compromise, 79; Webster on, 97; slavery in, 108, 254; IV, 300, 311; organization, III, 169; nonintervention of Congress, 183, 190; IV, 28; power of Congress, 102, 124; constitution and, 119, 123; Freeport doctrine, 302.
Test, John, I, 98 *n.*
Texas, annexation, I, 248; II, 69, 73, 113; III, 106; sympathy, II, 83 *n.*; boundary, 112; III, 79; republic recognized, II, 113; population, 113 *n.*; slavery, 115; extension of, 116.
Thackeray, William Makepeace, I, 3 *n.*
Thayer, Eli, IV, 133; emigrant aid society, III, 299; Sharp's rifles, 316 *n.*; manager, IV, 49.
Thomas, Cheney, liquor law, I, 268.
Thomas, Hardin, I, 6 *n.*, 22 *n.*
Thomas, Jesse B., I, 165, 258 *n.*; bank resolutions, 168.
Thomas, John, major general, I, 31 *n.*
Thomas, John B., II, 289 *n.*
Thomas, William, II, 99 *n.*
Thomas, W. W., Lincoln's fairness, II, 246.
Thomas, ——, I, 218 *n.*
Thompson, Jacob, IV, 172 *n.*; amending Constitution, II, 156 *n.*
Thompson, Jacob Champion, I, viii.
Thompson, Lorenzo D., I, 122.
Thompson, Richard W., II, 186.
Thomson, William, on slavery, III, 44 *n.*
Thwaites, Reuben Gold, on Filson, I, 8 *n.*
Tichenor, Isaac Taylor, III, 333 *n.*
Ticknor, George, III, 130 *n.*; IV, 180.
Tillson, Christiana Holmes, I, 50 *n.*
Tillson, John, IV, 276 *n.*
Tobacco, use of, I, 52.
Tocqueville, Alexis de, III, 65 *n.*
Todd, Anne Maria, II, 10 *n.*, 26.
Todd, Eliza (Parker) Todd, II, 10.
Todd, Elizabeth (Humphreys), II, 11.
Todd, Elizabeth (Porter), II, 10.
Todd, Frances, II, 10, 13.
Todd, Hannah, II, 10.
Todd, Levi, II, 12, 249.
Todd, Mary, visits Springfield, II, 10; education, 11; ambition, 12; Douglas and, 13, 17 *n.*; Hanks-Lincoln family, 14; engaged to Lincoln, 14; warned by Edwards, 15, 17; releases Lincoln, 17; diversion, 34; Mrs. Francis and, 36, 57; reason for secrecy, 37; Rebecca letter, 46, 55 *n.*; rhyme on Shields, 47; marriage, 57. *See* Mary Todd Lincoln.
Todd, Robert Smith, II, 10, 12, 66; death and estate, 248.
Tompkins, Patrick W., II, 107 *n.*
Toombs, Robert, II, 111 *n.*, 126, 131, 137, 140 *n.*, 150, 153 *n.*; III, 31; in Congress, II, 109; war with Mexico, 120; young Indian, 136, 144; on Clay, 144 *n.*; address of South, 187, 189 *n.*; III, 70; for disunion, 73, 147; slavery, 117; Georgia platform, 144; compromise measure, 148; Fillmore, 149 *n.*; Pierce, 163; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 194; on Reeder, 337; bill on Kansas, 338; at North, IV, 54 *n.*; slavery in States, 303.
Topeka, Kas., Convention, III, 324; legislature, IV, 45.
Trailor, William, II, 258 *n.*
Travis, William Barret, II, 81.
Treason, IV, 90.
Treat, Samuel Hubbel, II, 97, 209; law business, I, 212 *n.*; judge, 297 *n.*
Trent, Ab, I, 142.
Trent and Trent, I, 128.
Trent, III, 87 *n.*
Trumbull, Julia (Jayne), II, 14 *n.*; marriage, 36 *n.*; Mrs. Lincoln. III, 286.
Trumbull, Lyman, I, 283, 291, 295; II, 39, 261; III, 273 *n.*; IV, 10, 41, 136, 229, 302; described, I, 275; State debt, 284; liquor law, 288; speech on Supreme Court, 296; wife, II, 14 *n.*; Lincoln's courtship, 36 *n.*; anti-Nebraska, III, 267; for Senate, 281; elected, 287; IV, 306; Lanphier attacks, III, 289; for president, IV, 136 *n.*; speech at Springfield, 157; on Douglas, 188, 313; in campaign, 248, 267; Chicago speech, 281; plot charged, 281; Douglas on, 287.
Tuck, Amos, slavery, II, 139 *n.*, 183 *n.*
Tucker, Clark, I, 34 *n.*
Tucker, Nathaniel Beverly, on state loyalty, III, 63; 'Partisan Leader,' 64 *n.*
Turner, L. Jay S., IV, 196 *n.*
Turner, Nat, insurrection, III, 16, 27 *n.*, 302.
Turner, Thomas J., senatorial campaign, III, 277, 278; resolutions, 292; at Freeport, IV, 306.
Turner, Timothy, temperance lecture, I, 249.
Turner, William, II, 258 *n.*
Turnham, David, I, 16 *n.*, 65, 71, 80, 99; grist mill, 46; books, 74; Lincoln's politics, 98 *n.*
Turpie, David, I, 39.
Tyler, E. R., IV, 126 *n.*
Tyler, John, I, 270; II, 61, 62; III, 106.

'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' II, 105 *n.*; III, 137, 227 *n.*
Union, slavery and the, III, 28; Nashville Convention, 71; Bloomington, IV, 10.
Union Marseillaise, IV, 64.
United Americans, III, 223.
United States, army, II, 113.
Unjust Judge, IV, 127 *n.*
Upham, William, slavery resolutions, III, 77.
Upshur, Abel Parker, slavery, III, 5 *n.*; slaves, 14 *n.*
Urbana, Ill., II, 206, 236, 242, 247; court house, 219 *n.*; Lincoln speaks, III, 271.
Utah, III, 177, 193, 236, 251; Mormon revolt, IV, 138; Douglas on, 140; Lincoln on, 148.
Utica, Free-Soil Convention, II, 146.

Van Arman, John, II, 301 *n.*
Van Bergen, Peter, I, 143 *n.*; II, 203.
Van Buren, John, III, 196.
Van Buren, Martin. I, 152, 172, 239, 243, 281, 282; II, 41, 170, 173, 181 *n.*; III, 110; address, I, 171; candidate, 262, 270; abuse of patronage, 282; visits Illinois, II, 35; III, 30 *n.*; defeat in convention, II, 69; nominated, 1848, 146, 164 *n.*; rejected, 161.
Vance, David, I, 24.
Vance, John, I, 133.
Vandalia, Ill., I, 175; II, 1; description, I, 160; name, 162 *n.*; State House, 163, 176; Democratic Convention, 171; growth, 176; grocery, 182; improvement convention, 196; branch bank, 202 *n.*; capital transferred to Springfield, 205, 234, 246, 268, 276.
Vandalia Inn, I, 160 *n.*
Vanderburg County, Ind., I, 40 *n.*
Vera Cruz, taken, II, 94.
Vermont, slavery resolutions, III, 77; fugitive slaves, 109.

Vesey, Denmark, III, 17 *n.*
Veto, presidential, use of, II, 159.
Vicksburg, Miss., mob violence, I, 227, 228.
Villard, Henry, IV, 230 *n.*; Mrs. Douglas, 278 *n.*
Vincennes, Ind., I, 103.
Vineyard, Mary S., *see* Mary Owens.
Virginia, III, 80 *n.*; IV, 236; currency, I, 7 *n.*; land sales, 7 *n.*, 8; taxes, 8 *n.*; law of inheritance, 12; resolution on Abolitionists, 189; debate on slavery, III, 16, 37, 98; emancipation, 32 *n.*, 109; slave parties, 40; slave breeding, 46; convicts, 51 *n.*; against secession, 144; Thayer in, 299 *n.*
Virginian, the, Chevalier on, III, 7.
Volk, Leonard Wells, meeting with Lincoln, IV, 253.
Volney, Constantine de, Ruins, I, 139.
Voorhees, Daniel Wolsey, IV, 179.
Votes, of unnaturalized inhabitants, I, 294.

Wade, Benjamin Franklin, III, 224, 337; IV, 56, 202, 203 *n.*; dislike of Sumner, III, 339.
Wade, Edward, III, 184 *n.*, 213.
Wadsworth, James Samuel, IV, 53.
Wagons, use of, I, 42.
Wakarusa (Lawrence), Kas., III, 301 *n.*; war, 327.
Walker, Amasa, III, 299.
Walker, Isaac P., license bill, I, 269.
Walker, Newton, I, 243.
Walker, Robert John, IV, 166, 168 *n.*; Kansas slavery, 165 *n.*, 171.
Walker, Thomas, II, 12 *n.*
Walker, William, II, 263 *n.*
Wallace, Daniel, disunion, III, 74.
Wallace, Frances (Todd), II, 10, 13, 248 *n.*; plants flowers, 204; Lincoln's abstraction, 210; home life, 211.
Wallace, Lew, II, 79, 206 *n.*; IV, 179.
Wallace, William S., II, 10, 13, 14.
Walters, William, public printer, I, 291; volunteers, II, 80 *n.*
Wanderer, Boston, on Lovejoy affair, I, 225.
Ward, James, IV, 226.
Warren, Charles, IV, 95, 202 *n.*
Warren, Louis Austin, birth of Thomas Lincoln, I, 6 *n.*
Warrick County, Ind., I, 40 *n.*
Washburne, Elihu Benjamin, II, 218; III, 273 *n.*; IV, 194, 306; Taylor campaign, II, 144; Whig Convention, III, 149; senatorial campaign, 277; objects to question, IV, 295.
Washington, George, an example, I, 74; name, II, 32; monument, 157; fugitive slave bill, III, 15; slave-holder, 54; fame, 90.
Washington, D.C., in 1848, II, 101; slavery, 103. *See* District of Columbia.
Washington Territory, III, 269.
Washington Union, II, 104; alarm of, III, 122; Douglas on, IV, 303.
Washingtonian Society, III, 228 *n.*; Lincoln's address, II, 28; origin, 28 *n.*; Tee-Totalers' minstrel, 28 *n.*
Water, Thomas Lincoln's neglect, I, 40, 61.
Wathen, Thomas J., I, 95.
Watkins, Nelson *or* William, II, 269.
Watkins, William, II, 203.
Watson, ——, visits Lincoln, II, 280.
Wayne, James Moore, Dred Scott, IV, 104; decision to be by Taney, 105; described, 113; Missouri Compromise, 121.
Wayne County, Ind., mill, I, 46 *n.*
Wead, Hezekiah Morse, II, 303.
Webb, Edwin B., II, 8; IV, 195; described, I, 178; protest on internal improvement act, 199; license bill, 268; Republican movement, IV, 22.
Webber, Thompson R., II, 289.
Weber, Jessie Palmer, I, ix; II, 10 *n.*
Webster, Daniel, I, 2 *n.*, 130, 270 *n.*; II, 90, 107, 110, 144, 150, 163; III, 78, 150, 155; reply to Hayne, I, 100; IV, 214, 215 *n.*; bank, I, 167; visits Springfield, 210; currency, 242; Taylor campaign, II, 145, 170; Butterfield and, 192; Seventh of March Speech, III, 94, 119, 127 *n.*; health, 94, 130 *n.*; secession, 99; slavery and climate, 101, 176; abolition clamor, 102, 127; death, 102; northwestern democracy, 106; higher law, 112; Fugitive Slave Law, 126; funeral, 128 *n.*; defence, 130, 135.
Webster, Fletcher, IV, 52.
Weddings in Kentucky, I, 17 *n.*
Weed, Thurlow, II, 90, 146, 152; III, 225; IV, 197, 350; Lincoln sees, II, 179.
Weems, Mason Locke, Washington and Franklin, I, 76.
Weik, Jesse William, I, vii, 15 *n.*; II, 309 *n.*; interview with Mrs. Edwards, 16 *n.*; Lincoln's sadness, 227.
Welby, Adlard, I, 38.
Weldon, Lawrence, II, 237 *n.*, 298; Lincoln's abstraction, 225; readiness to aid, 230.
Weller, John B., III, 210, 211; Pacific Railroad, 170 *n.*; Kansas-Nebraska bill, 203; Chase's election, 212.
Welles, Gideon, II, 110.
Wells, David Ames, 'Annual,' II, 218.
Wells, Robert W., IV, 96.
Welsh, John, I, 25.
Wendell, Cornelius, against Douglas, IV, 181; lobbyist, 199.
Wentworth, John, II, 138 *n.*; III, 277; IV, 59, 192, 346; on Douglas, I, 182; internal improvements, II, 111 *n.*; Lincoln defends, IV, 187; career and Senate, 203; beaten, 210.
Wesley, John, III, 33 *n.*
Wesleyan societies, III, 56 *n.*
West, political future, III, 106; migration to, 166.
'Western Citizen,' III, 19 *n.*
Weston, G. M., miscegenation, III, 24.
Westport, Mo., resolutions, III, 258 *n.*
Wheeler, Alpheus, internal improvements, I, 198.
Whig, contest over name, I, 172; party in Illinois, 272; junto, Springfield, II, 5; address, 1843, 60; platform, 1844, 69; against expansion, 118; war with Mexico, 118, 120, 123; resolutions, 1848, 146; songs, 148; Massachusetts, 176; last national victory, 190; convention, 1850, III, 149; foundations, 164; conventions, IV, 40; Baltimore, 60; meetings, 70.
Whisky, Knob Creek farm, I, 35; consumption of, 51; in stores, II, 200; story of, 235; suit over, 251.
White, Horace, accompanies Lincoln, III, 244 *n.*; IV, 282, 310 *n.*, 318 *n.*; Lincoln's anti-slavery views, III, 249; Springfield speech, IV, 215 *n.*, 223; on Mrs. Douglas, 283; conference, 294 *n.*
White, Hugh, II, 152 *n.*
White, Hugh Lawson, I, 152, 172, 173, 270.
White, J. B., II, 254 *n.*
Whitefield, George, slave-holder, III, 55.

Whites, poor, in the South, III, 4; hookworm, 4 *n.*; favor slavery, 5; supremacy of, IV, 235.
Whiteside, John Davis, II, 8 *n.*; Lincoln-Shields affair, 48; Merryman and, 55, 56.
Whitfield, John W., delegate, III, 309, 310 *n.*
Whiting, Charles, I, 95 *n.*
Whitney, Henry Clay, II, 230, 238, 250; III, 287; IV, 258; on Herndon, II, 17 *n.*; association with Lincoln, 206; description, 206; Lincoln and wife, 211; reading, 222; abstraction, 225, 227; eating, 235; drinking, 237; character, 240; on Chiniquy, 243; Lincoln's honesty, 246; animus as lawyer, 249; want of method, 256; petty cases, 258 *n.*; Illinois Central, 296, 297; in Chicago, 301 *n.*; Urbana speech, III, 272; Bloomington Convention, IV, 1; Lincoln's lost speech, 11, 18; letters, 187 *n.*
Whittier, John Greenleaf, II, 169; 'Ichabod,' III, 129; 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 138; 'Kansas Emigrants,' 301.
Wickliffe, Robert, I, 19 *n.*
Wickliffe family, II, 141.
Wide Awakes, III, 224; IV, 63.
Wilcox, Ben, I, 113 *n.*
'William Riley,' I, 69.
Williams, Archibald, I, 183, 210; II, 144, 147, 294; described, I, 179; financial policy, 240; opposes Lincoln's land scheme, 253; sales of lands, 256; Bloomington Convention, IV, 3, 7.
Williams, Robert E., II, 295 *n.*
Williamson, John, II, 23.
Wills, John A., II, 301 *n.*
Wilmot, David, IV, 30, 37, 348; in Congress, II, 110; proviso, 121, 139, 155, 160, 162, 183; III, 71 *n.*, 79, 107, 113, 125, 136, 246; revenue measure, II, 140.
Wilson, Charles Lush, IV, 176 *n.*; against Wentworth, 207; resolution on Lincoln, 211; negro equality, 235.
Wilson, Henry, II, 170; III, 207 *n.*, 217 *n.*; IV, 56; career, II, 169; Fugitive Slave Law, III, 126; Free-Soil Convention, 156; Know-Nothing, 225; Kansas election, 309; disunion, IV, 91; favors Douglas, 184.
Wilson, Isaac Grant, II, 277 *n.*
Wilson, James, representation and slaves, III, 60.
Wilson, Robert L., I, 154 *n.*, 196 *n.*
Wilson, William, chief justice, I, 177, 296 *n.*; II, 97.
Wilson and Parker, of Lexington, Ky., I, 20 *n.*
Winchester, Ill., IV, 286.
Winn, James, I, 11 *n.*
Winslow, Warren, on Brooks, III, 348 *n.*
Winthrop, John, Governor, III, 102.
Winthrop, Robert Charles, II, 131, 139 *n.*, 155, 176; speaker, 109, 111, 189; Washington monument, 158; reëlected, 170; opinion of Lincoln, 171; Oregon, III, 107.
Wirt, William, II, 10 *n.*; on Taney, IV, 114; negroes not citizens, 118.
Wise, Henry Alexander, III, 353; on Frémont, IV, 68; Kansas, 170.
Women, Lincoln and, I, 144; II, 9.
Wood, John, Matson case, II, 100 *n.*
Wood, John P., III, 325 *n.*
Wood, William, I, 48, 65, 83, 87, 97, 99; on Thomas Lincoln, 61; Lincoln's poems, 64; essay, 82; Lincoln's ambition, 89.
Woodbury, Levi, I, 241.
Woodpecker tapping, I, 136.
Woods, John, I, 51 *n.*, 90 *n.*
Woodson, Daniel, IV, 61.
Woodworth, James H., III, 273 *n.*
Worcester, Mass., Whig Convention, 1848, II, 172; Lincoln's speech, 173; disunion convention, IV, 89.
Wright case, II, 259.
Wright, Henry Clarke, III, 26 *n.*, 27 *n.*; kidnappers, 134; disunion conventions, IV, 90 *n.*
Wyandot Indians, III, 173.

Yates, Richard, III, 281 *n.*; IV, 208, 346.
Yeomanry of South. *See* Farmers.
Young, Brigham, IV, 66.
Young, Richard Montgomery, I, 165; U.S. Senator, 183; banquet, 183.

Zacatecas, Mexico, II, 115.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

1809–1858

Standard Library Edition

In Four Volumes

VOLUME IV

